

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

APRIL, 1881.

ART. I.—WESTERN SUSSEX.

THE BORDERS OF THE ARUN AND THE ADUR.

NO. II.

PROCEEDING—in continuation of our subject—to consider the history and antiquities of Western Sussex, we are met by the difficulty involved in the use of these terms. In popular parlance, and even in what appears to be the accepted terminology of our learned societies, as well as the usage of so thoughtful a writer as Mr. Carlyle, history is the term applied to the investigation into, and exposition of, the main events in the life of nations, the succession of dynasties, the course of wars, the acquisitions of commerce, of everything that, comprehensively viewed, has moulded, for good or for evil, national destinies. Antiquities, on the other hand, are relegated to the shelf as trivial and puerile, or, in Mr. Carlyle's phrase, "parochial," as mere raspings and filings that cannot be turned to account in the shapely work of history, and that may be the appropriate interest and employment of petty minds. It is sad to think that the Prospero, whose wand appears to have been buried with him in the tomb we lately re-visited in the solemn aisle of St. Mary at Dryburgh, should in one of his most engaging and popular works have aided in stereotyping this erroneous conception. As the "Don Quixote" of Cervantes is the dirge of chivalry, so is the "Antiquary" of Sir Walter Scott the dirge of Antiquarianism. We cannot doubt that Cervantes had much sympathy with what he ridiculed. So assuredly had Sir Walter Scott, both with the thing and with the person he ridiculed, who was in some sense his very self. But the mockery has had its effect, and has been echoed back from all quarters. From far America, Emerson tells us that the race of antiquaries should be extinguished. Few and far

between, nay perchance altogether exotic, are the antiquaries of New England! And yet what does this outcry mean? What is an antiquary but the student and expositor of the past? Some years ago, in a now forgotten pamphlet, we threw together various testimonies of the ancients as to the scope of antiquarian study. With this result: Plato (speaking in the character of Socrates), Cicero, and St. Augustine confess with one mouth that archæology, the Latin *Antiquitates*, has for its scope the study of the past in its most extended significance, that of religion, law, philosophy, art, as well as of manners and customs, that, in fact, the narrative of human achievements which is history should be a section or sub-section of antiquities, and not antiquities a by-path of history. Here we have a treatment of the subject widely different from that of the antiquaries of the Stukeley and Monkbarns breed. Mr. Jonathan Oldbuck, railing at Mrs. Macleuchar, bargaining with the Mucklebackits, holding aloof from the machinations of the German adept, Dousterswivel, is contrasted in all his Scotch pawkiness and shrewdness, with the same person dealing forth to Lovel all his tediousness with a resolution worthy of Dogberry in his Essay on Castramentation, and showing his credulity in his identification of the Prætorium of Agricola with the Kaim of Kinprunes. These it may be said are the follies of the wise, but in truth the character of the antiquary is a folly, however much redeemed by good sense and good feeling, that plentifully infused yet fail to leaven the whole mass. He is not indeed "an old tup-headed ass," as he discriminately describes his *bon camarade*, Sir Arthur Wardour, but he does nothing even in his favourite study beyond writing some unpublished essays, and boring his friends with theories hard of digestion. But if Sir Walter Scott pulled down, he also built up. To him Dr. Thomas Arnold attributes "the genius of history." To him history in large measure owes it that a vast number of subjects previously tabooed as unbecoming its dignity are now universally admitted to be altogether within its range. It has in truth now the ease and freedom the ancients ascribed to the study of antiquities. It now contemplates all the past, with the exception of such portions as have been shorn from its province by the greatly extended domain of physical science. Antiquities and history are simply one and the same thing. For the sake of convenience, it may be necessary to speak of them as separate, but no really satisfactory line of demarcation can be fixed between them. All we can say is, that what is now generally recognized as history is the more generally valued ingredient of a composite whole. The frivolous study of antiquities has yielded to their orderly and sober study. Conjectures and chimeras have disappeared. When Sir Walter Scott wrote "Marmion," and the fine clear narrative of the

Second Series of the "Tales of a Grandfather," he was a sounder and better antiquary than in his museum at Abbotsford, with its mingled flavour of St. John's Wood and Trotosey; Terry and the property-man pass from view, and the very stones of his much-loved Scotland become vocal as the lips of Memnon.

The Arun and the Adur must yield in natural beauty and romantic interest to the Tweed and the Teviot. But the Poet-Chronicler of these streams has taught a lesson of general application. Local history must be elicited from the objects of the country and the traditions of the people, and we should compose the dullest of narratives if we viewed the history of any locality, however favoured, merely or chiefly in connection with the general history of the country. For example: That King John sailed with a numerous fleet from Shoreham harbour, that Charles II., after Worcester finally made his escape from the same port, are facts that, however interesting, are, nakedly stated, no way characteristic of Sussex; but let us view them through a local medium, and they will be found to wear a very different complexion. We have given a sketch in our former article of the physical transformation of Shoreham harbour. It declined as a seaport till, from being a successful rival of the great harbour of London, it did but carry on a minor trade with France, and, as has been the case with so many an inferior and neglected seaport, became the haunt of smugglers. Viewed then, we say, with reference to that change in Shoreham harbour from a wide, shallow estuary, such as may be seen at Porchester, suited to the small draught of the fleets of early days, to its present form, these facts acquire a new significance; they are not thrown down casually as seeds at random, but upon prepared soil where they take root and grow.

We shall proceed, in dealing with the antiquities of our division of Western Sussex, to consider them in the following order: The Celtic; The Roman; The Saxon; The Mediæval, subdivided into Episcopal, Monastic, Feudal, and Parochial; The Domestic; Antiquities relating to the former Iron Manufacture. This will, we think, be a pretty complete division of the whole subject, and will be, at any rate, amply sufficient for everything we can at present undertake. It is our intention, as will be seen as we proceed, to throw aside, as far as may be, the too rigid distinction between ecclesiastical and secular, and to consider the work of the churchmen and nobles as forming a homogeneous whole. Such an amalgamation is, we believe, true to history, as the powerful spirit of chivalry so wrought upon the fabric of feudalism as to give it a religious character and purpose, and it is abundantly certain that it is in and through the fabrics of our Churches that we must read many a page in the history of feudalism. Again, the churchmen of those days held—as the only men possessed of

education—many secular offices, and they cannot be altogether viewed in the same light as modern ecclesiastics. We have separated episcopal and monastic antiquities from others of the feudal period, because the former appear, with reference to our special district, rather an in-growth than an out-growth, and the latter, however intimately allied with the history of this or that noble family, pertain to an institution of too early an origin and too separate an aim to be considered under the general head of feudalism.

Further, there was a distinction drawn by Archdeacon Hannah, in a Paper he read upon "Sussex Churches" before the Sussex Archæological Society in the autumn of last year that arrested our attention, and that may here be usefully employed. He spoke of those "where the architectural interest was concentrated on a single style," and of those that resembled a palimpsest "in which one style crossed out and obliterated another, till modern skill read the riddle, and re-interpreted the stratified records of the past." Obvious as such a distinction is, its force had not previously struck us as showing that a line might be drawn between such as might be regarded simply as illustrations of the art of the period in which they were erected, and that might be considered along with it, and such as require distinct treatment and, as it were, explanation from within, that they may become intelligible, and that their primitive form and successive incrustations may stand out each from each, and, to use a geological phrase, the line of cleavage be clearly perceptible. In a general ecclesiological survey of a country or province such a distinction would not be available, as the whole subject would have to be considered, and the simpler notes, so to speak, could not be omitted from the composition. But in a minor survey, such as that upon which we are now engaged, this distinction may be turned to account. We shall, therefore, when we come to that portion of our subject, briefly enumerate the Saxon churches of our district, viewing the art displayed in them as the successor of that of the Romans and Romanized Britons.

At the northern extremity of the parish of Broadwater, upon a commanding eminence in full view of Worthing—which is some three miles distant—is the encampment known as Cissbury, surrounded by a single ditch and double rampart. Although at the present day standing bare upon a stretch of down sprinkled with juniper and exempt from the labours of agriculture, Cissbury, as is shown by its terraced sides, was, during the Roman occupation, or even at an earlier date, cultivated for the vine. The area enclosed by the camp is sixty acres. There is a bridle road from Broadwater which traverses the camp and passes on to Steyning. The ditch is filled in at two other points by an embankment.

Over that on the eastern side we first entered the camp, from the downs above Sompting. Nothing can be more exhilarating than the view gained by climbing the height of Cissbury, and even in misty weather, as may be seen by reference to Southey's *Life* (vol. vi. p. 325), remarkable effects are to be observed. The camp commands the coast from Beachy Head to Selsey Bill, and looks across the open country at the foot of the downs towards Portus Magnus (Porchester), where the massive keep shows as a faint speck upon the western horizon. Nearer is the tapering spire of the Cathedral of Chichester, and over it the weather-gleam, and predictive of rain when visible, may be caught from time to time glimpses of the chalk cliffs of Brading, where have lately been discovered the choicest treasures of Roman Vectis. The sixty miles of coast thus expanded to the eye have been described by Major-General Pitt Rivers* in his account of "Excavations in Cissbury Camp," read before the Anthropological Society, in November, 1875, as "in the form of a bow, as seen from the arrow's point," and no more felicitous image could have been chosen.

Cissbury is undoubtedly the largest and the most important of the Southdown fortifications.

Among the earliest expositors of Cissbury is the illustrious Camden, who speaks in his "*Britannia*" of it as the work of Cissa, whom we know as one of the sons of Ella, and from whom Chichester derives its name. But, if of Saxon nomenclature, Cissbury is not of Saxon origin, but of an earlier period. It forms part of a chain of fortifications, the others being Chanctonbury and Highdown, within easy signalling distance, that command the Sussex coast between the mouths of the Arun and the Adur, and the line of which is continued beyond those rivers by the camp at Devil's Dyke above Brighton and Hangleton, on the east, and that on Rook's, or St. Roche's Hill, known as the *Trundle*, above the race-course at Goodwood, on the west.

On the western slope of Cissbury are circular pits of various diameter and depth, similar to those found at the *Trundle*; at Wolstanbury Camp, above Danny Park, at Hurstpierpoint; and at Hollingsbury Castle, near Stanmer Park. At Cissbury there is a double row of equidistant depressions along the hillside, and found both within and without the area of the Camp. The excavations undertaken of late years followed the line of these hollows at the point where it crossed the earthworks of the Camp, and opened the pits—there hidden on the surface by the earthworks—to a depth of several feet. Here they were found

* Perhaps better known as Colonel James Fox.

to throw off low level galleries. From the way in which they are traversed by the earthworks, it appears evident that the latter are of subsequent date. The Camp of Cissbury is an irregular oval, and not circular, as is so frequently the case with British camps, many of which we have visited in other years, and more particularly in Northumberland, where well-nigh every hill and mount is topped by a rampart of that form. The intention at Cissbury appears to have been so to form the Camp as to include the more important of the previously formed vertical shafts which—whatever may have been their purpose—appear to have been important to the occupants of the fortified work. But this regard for them was eventually laid aside: they were disused and finally closed up. Major-General Rivers concluded his Paper before the Anthropological Institute, as follows:—"Considering the nature of the implements at the service of such a people, such shafts and galleries must have been great and laborious undertakings, having corresponding advantages, as connected with their means of living, such as winter underground retreats for themselves, after the manner of the Cave people, for which the small galleries would be well suited, or else as storing-places for grain and provender, as was done underground by the Rhemi of Gaul, whence the early inhabitants of this part of England came."

We owe to Major-General Pitt Rivers the information that excavations in which he was engaged in the outer part of the "ring" at Chanetonbury were attended by no interesting discovery, and the explorations conducted by that gentleman and by Mr. J. Park Harrison, in successive years at Cissbury, and fully recorded by them in the Journal of the Anthropological Institute, having been unusually fertile in results, we shall leave the subject of Celtic antiquities with such short notice as our limits have enabled us to give of the latter Camp, and proceed to treat of the Roman roads in Sussex, and of the structural remains bequeathed us by that people.

We premise, that—our Anglo-Saxon ancestors gave the name of Street (*stræt*), doubtless derived from the Latin *strata*, by which term the Romans and Romanized Britons designated their means of communication, to those Roman roads which they re-baptized from their own theology and traditions. From Ermyrn, one of their chief divinities they named Ermyrn Street, which led from Chichester and Pevensy, through London, Lincoln, and the Yorkshire towns to the south-east of Scotland.

Of Roman roads in Sussex, our knowledge from the Itineraries is somewhat obscure. That of Antoninus begins, *a Regno* (Chichester), and pursues the following course, altogether without the bounds of Sussex:—Clausentum (old Southampton), Venta

Belgarum (Winchester), Caleva (probably Silchester), Pontibus (old Windsor), London. The Itinerary of Richard of Cirencester traverses the coast from west to east, with the omission of that next beyond *Ad Decimum*, which is—as we shall see—with much probability identified with Bignor. The missing link is supplied by the Itinerary of the anonymous geographer of Ravenna, and Mutuantonis (Lewes) is considered the completion of the course. This would be the Eastern Stane Street, the traces of which have entirely disappeared. The Stane Street Causeway, or Western Stane Street, opened out from the Ermyn Street, south of London. According to Higden, in his “Polychronicon” (strangely quoted as an authority by Horsfield, whilst saying nothing to the purpose), the Ermyn Street was constructed by Belinus, the son of Molmutius, from whom Billingsgate derives its name. This Belinus, if Higden may be trusted, was a great road-maker; passing over, however, his other exploits, we transcribe in modern guise the extravagantly incorrect passage relating to the Ermyn Street. “The third way is called Ermyn Street, and stretcheth out of the west-north-west to the east-south-east, and beginneth in Menævia, that is, in St. David’s land, in West Wales, and stretcheth forth anon to South Hampton”! The Western Stane Street was, according to Horsfield, probably a *diverticulum* from the Ermyn Street, the course of which is certainly not determined by Higden. Leaving London by Billingsgate, it entered Sussex at Rudgwick, a parish to the south-west of Horsham, where it crossed the river Arun at Rowhook. To the north of Slinfold *Roman Gate* marks its course, and the long undeviating line of road from that point to the village of Slinfold may safely be attributed to a Roman origin. From Slinfold it passes by Billingshurst (another suggestion of Belinus?) to Pulborough, where it crosses a branch of the Arun. To the west of the line of road, there is at Hardham a square Roman entrenchment, now much torn up by the railway, at which remains have been found. No further trace occurs of the road, which must have recrossed the river by a ford, probably near Bury, till it arrives at the foot of Bignor Hill, where its gradual ascent is very perceptible. On arriving at the summit of the hill, it deviates a little, to avoid a cluster of barrows there situated, evidently shown by this circumstance to be of previous construction. From this point, it strikes across the Downs and through North Wood, on the confines of which it reaches the modern road from Petworth to Chichester. Its further course lies beyond our special district, but we may briefly mention that, leaving the Chichester and Petworth road, and passing straight over the hill, it rejoins it at the entrance to Halnaker, successively the seat of the Dr. Haid, St. John, and Poynings families, and accompanies it into Chichester,

past the village of *Strettington*. This road even runs beyond Chichester by Birdham Common to Bracklesham, where probably was the last station, now with nearly the whole of that parish swept away by the sea, which has so greatly reduced the dimensions of the peninsula of Selsey.

The material of this road was pebble and gravel from the sea-shore, and that apparently throughout its whole course, however distant from the coast. At Pulborough, where descending the hill, the road was paved with large stones. From the foot of Bignor Hill to Halnaker the road is marked with very great distinctness; the *dorsum* is seen to have been over twenty feet wide, and the sides three or four feet high.

A Roman road led from the *Portus Adurni* across the Downs to the east of the Adur, and by Clayton Hill across St. John's Common to Ardingly and Wakehurst, in Sussex, and thence into Surrey. This road, pronounced "undoubted" by Horsfield, is unnoticed by the Itineraries. As Horsfield, against the better-received opinion, places the *Portus Adurni* at Aldrington, his notion of this road may be adopted with caution.

The Roman architectural remains of this portion of Western Sussex are of much importance. The most memorable of these are the foundation walls and pavements of the villa at Bignor, a secluded hamlet on the northern side of the Downs, at a distance of some six miles from Arundel, and an equal distance from Petworth. The Roman road—known by the Saxon appellation of Stane Street, of which we have been speaking—runs near the village on its way from Chichester to Pulborough, and S. Lysons, in his contribution to the *Archæologia* on the subject of the Roman remains at Bignor, conjectures with much probability that here was the *Ad Decimum* of the Itinerary of Richard of Cirencester, omitted in that of Antoninus.

The province of the *Regni*, of which *Regnum*, Chichester, ten miles distant hence, was the capital, was in all likelihood in the occupation of one of those two most powerful peoples who, according to Suetonius, were subjugated by the Romans under Vespasian in the reign of Claudius. Certain it is that a British prince, Cogidunus, submitted to the Romans, received several cities from them, and, as we learn from the inscription preserved at Goodwood, ordered the erection at *Regnum* of a temple of Neptune and Minerva by the *Collegium Fabrorum*.

The colours found upon the walls at Bignor are similar to those employed at Pompeii and Herculaneum, and in the baths of Titus at Rome. Such was the testimony of Sir Humphry Davy, to whose examination specimens of each of their varieties were submitted.

The ornaments and general character of the pavements nearly

resemble those of Pompeii, and they, we know, cannot be later than the time of Titus. These beautiful works are therefore to be ascribed with some degree of certainty to the early days of the Roman Empire. The ground-plan is somewhat irregular, but supposing it described by a parallelogram having its greatest extension from east to west, the more important portion of the buildings will be found in the western half of such a parallelogram, where they surround a vast oblong court. The position and character of the principal pavements may be briefly indicated as follows :—

(A.) On the north side of the court, somewhat westward of the middle line, is a room conjectured to have been a *triclinium*, or banquetting-room, having a pavement representing in one compartment Ganymede borne off by the eagle, surrounded by a braided guilloche, or twisted band, composed of five rows of *tesserae*, whilst the other and larger one—also circular—contains six hexagonal subdivisions, each of them bordered with a fret and guilloche. These compartments contain figures of dancing nymphs. The spandrels of the great circle were filled in with ivy leaves. In the centre of the great compartment is an hexagonal cistern, four feet in diameter. Beneath the floor was a hypocaust, or underground furnace, several of the flues of which have given way with much injury to the pavement above.

(B.) At the north-western angle of the great court another pavement was discovered, consisting, like the first, of two compartments, that at the north end containing four octagonal divisions, each having a figure resembling a star formed by interlaced squares enclosing heads, one of which remains and was evidently designed for Winter. The other three probably represented the other seasons. The other compartment included a circle with eight hexagonal divisions, each connected with one side of an octagon. The spandrels were filled in with ovals, one of which still contains part of a figure of a boy, whilst at each side of the oval is a pheasant and a cornucopia.

(C.) Between these two pavements, in an apartment adjoining the recess in the great *triclinium* having the pavement first described, another was discovered later, consisting of two square compartments with an oblong between them, having in its centre a goblet from which issued two scrolls of ivy leaves, surrounded by a guilloche and an indented border. In the centre of one of the square compartments was a minor square enclosing a large rose, around which figure was an octagon filled in with squares and rhombs in which were frets and ivy leaves. The other square compartments also enclosed a minor square surrounded by a star-shaped figure formed by rhombs.

(D.) Interesting and artistic as are these pavements, they are

far surpassed by that laid open later, near that last described, and towards the exterior north-west angle of the entire block of buildings. Here the design consists of a large square compartment, between two narrow oblong ones, with a semicircular fourth division occupying an apsidal recess at the north end. The square encloses an octagon, having within it eight oblong compartments converging towards a centre which—though now destroyed—appears to have been in the form of an octagon. The small oblong compartments contain figures of Cupids or Genii dancing as Bacchantes. The large oblong compartment to the north of the great square has twelve winged figures of Cupids or Genii habited as gladiators. Here may be seen the *Retiarii*, with net, trident, and short sword; the *Secutores*, with the armour on account of which they obtained the appellation *Samnites*—viz., a shield wider at the top than at the bottom, a crested helmet, and a greave for the left leg; and the *Rudarii*, or veteran gladiators, with the rod which was the token of their manumission, and wherewith they regulated the combat. In four scenes these parties are shown as, (1) preparing for the fight; (2) as just engaged in it; whilst (3) shows the *Retiarius* wounded by the bloody sword of his opponent, and the *Rudarius* coming to his assistance. In the last scene, (4) the *Retiarius* is fallen, disarmed, whilst his thigh exhibits a wound. In the midst of the apsidal recess is a female head adorned with a chaplet of flowers, whilst her tresses fall upon her shoulders which are nude. This head is nimbed, and, being evidently that of a deity, is generally supposed to represent Venus. The colour of the nimbus is a light blue. The *tessere* that form the pavements are a dark brown, red, yellow, white, ash colour, blue, and black. The apartments in which these pavements are found are undoubtedly the household apartments of the villa, but the *triclinium*, or banquetting-hall, is probably the only one the destination of which can be assigned with absolute certainty. The household rooms stood round the vast oblong court which we mentioned. The entire extent of the remains at Bignor, as traced by excavation, is about 600 feet in length, and 350 feet in breadth. A gallery, or, in classic phrase, *Cryptoporticus*, surrounded the whole inner court. In a chamber, at the south-east angle of this portico, is a pavement with a circle composed of a guilloche, between two indented borders, containing a head of Medusa, a subject we find repeated at Bramdean, in Hampshire.

The remains of the villa are shown by the family of the discoverer, Mr. George Tupper, who struck up the first fragments of mosaic pavement when ploughing, now seventy years since. They are, perhaps, the finest remains in England, unless surpassed by those recently discovered at Brading, in the Isle of Wight.

The remains at Bignor are splendidly, though incompletely, illustrated in the third volume of S. Lysons' "*Reliquiæ Britannico-Romanæ*."

There is a ground-plan, apparently reduced from that given by S. Lysons, in Dallaway's "*Sussex*;" where will also be found a representation of the Ganymede not contained in the "*Reliquiæ*," or at least that copy of it which is in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries, which we may presume to be as perfect as any. There is a drawing of a corner of the *Cryptoporticus* at Bignor, in Mr. T. Wright's "*The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*," but this is apparently merely an adaptation—*minus* the colours—from the tail-piece to S. Lysons' "*List of Plates*." It is much to be regretted that Mr. C. Roach Smith should have written nothing upon Bignor in his valuable *Collectanea Antiqua*, whilst explaining and illustrating the very inferior villa at Carisbrooke, and dwelling upon Roman remains in our very district, at Hardham and Lancing. We had completed the above account ere we received the thirtieth volume of the "*Sussex Archæological Collections*," in which the subject of the Villa at Bignor is treated afresh by the Rev. T. Debary. So much for the bibliography of the subject; it may be expedient to subjoin a few remarks upon the general character of Roman villas.

Ancient writers commend as sites gently sloping ground as preferable either to hill or vale, a choice that, opposed in the former case to much modern, and in the latter to much mediæval practice, has the very evident advantages of avoiding the damp, which is one trying vicissitude, and the winds, which are another trying vicissitude, of our climate. The condition was well observed in the villa at Woodchester, in Gloucestershire, and in that at Bignor. The former is situated in a beautiful valley, in the uplands adjoining the Vale of Gloucester, by the side of a stream that thence winds its way to the Severn, at a distance of some four miles from the Roman road leading from Cirencester (*Corinium*) to Aust Passage (*Trajectus Augusti*), and in a position very favourable to that country seclusion and retirement that the Romans loved. The Roman villa at Bignor has a somewhat analogous position. It has the good road, the pure air, the wholesome water from the stream, the fertile soil, that were thought needful accessories to an edifice of this sort by the Roman masters of the art of life. A page from the younger Pliny ("*Epistolarum*," lib. ii. 19) may be here introduced as showing how fondly the Roman dwelt upon his rural retreat :—

You wonder why my Laurentinum, or, if you prefer it, Laurens, so greatly delights me. You will cease to wonder when you shall have learned the attractions of the villa, the convenience of the locality, and

the extent of the shore. It is seventeen miles from the city, so that after concluding one's affairs, one can reach it and yet have the whole day before one. The approach is not by a single road, as both the Laurentine and the Ostian lead hither, but the Laurentine has to be left at the fourteenth milestone, the Ostian at the eleventh. The remaining journey, after leaving either road, is in some part sandy, somewhat heavy and tedious to beasts of burden, but short and easy for the saddle. The appearance of the country is diversified. At times the road is hemmed in by the approach of forests, at times there occur the widest meadows, to which it lies open. Many flocks of sheep, many horses and herds of cattle are to be seen, that have been driven by the winter from the mountains, and are sleek there with the herbage and the warmth of spring. The villa is of ample accommodation, not costly to keep up.

Into the details of Pliny's villa, whether at Laurentum, or on the Lake of Como, we need not enter. The arrangements of an Italian villa must have been greatly modified by the necessities of our climate, and we understand that the attempt made by S. Lysons to apply strict Vitruvian principles to the ground-plan of the villa at Woodchester has not met with the general assent and approval of antiquaries. And the villa at Bignor is more irregular in plan than that at Woodchester. They have in common the division into two courts. The aspect, however, is different. Those at Bignor run north-west and south-east, whilst those at Woodchester run nearly due north and south. The *Cryptoporticus* at Bignor is more extensive than that at Woodchester. The baths, which are at the south-east corner of the inner court, are larger and more clearly marked than those at Woodchester. We may here remark that baths are never found in Roman remains in England on such a scale as in Italy; they here served the purpose of cleanliness, and nothing more. We may further note that rooms, frequently called baths, are in truth merely winter rooms heated by the hypocaust, or underground furnace. May we not say further, that a distinction frequently drawn between summer and winter apartments is not to be too hastily made? If the fire of the hypocaust were extinguished, a room heated by it might, if it were not of unsuitable exposure, be very well adapted for summer use. Indeed, over-ingenuity of conjecture is a thing very much to be avoided. In Messrs. Buckman and Newmarch's work on the Roman remains at Cirencester (*Corinium*), they suppose, from the fact that the hypocaust extends only under one-half of the floor, "that the two parts of the room were intended for use at different seasons of the year, and that it was the *triclinium* of the house; that portion over the hypocaust being the *triclinium hibernum*, and the other end the *triclinium æstivum* for use in warm weather. As

Mr. T. Wright very sensibly observes, if you extinguish the fire in your hypocaust, what superior warmth has your *triclinium hibernum*, and, if you light it, where is the coolness of your *triclinium æstivum*?

There is a valuable remark in the third volume of Waagen's "Treasures of Art in Great Britain" (p. 31) having reference to Bignor, which we make haste to transcribe: "The ornaments (of the pavements) are partly of very beautiful designs, and many of them may be immediately distinguished as the originals of the entwined forms met with so constantly in the border decorations and initials of the Irish, Anglo-Saxon, and Frankish MSS. of the eighth century."

This observation appears to us of very great interest, and there are within our district the means of its verification in the carvings of this character in the chancel of the undoubted Saxon church of Sompting, and, we believe also, in the ornate capitals of the chancel arch of the small and hitherto little observed church of Selham, between Midhurst and Petworth. There will probably be an illustration of these by Mr. J. L. André, Architect in Horsham, in the forthcoming volume of the Anastatic Society. Here a curious question arises: How could the Anglo-Saxons form designs from the Roman pavements, if these were buried under the débris occasioned by the fall of the superincumbent roofs and of the walls? If the Anglo-Saxons drew from these art treasures, they must have been in great measure visible in their time. We can perhaps reply to this question by asking another: Were the Roman houses in England constructed of stone or brick from the floor to the roof, or did these solid materials always, as now, merely form a *dado* round the apartments, the upper part of the walls being formed of wood? That the latter suggestion is not improbable, is shown by the fact that in very many instances the low remaining walls do not end in a broken line, but are on the same level throughout the building. We can very well suppose that if the upper walls were of wood, and the roofs—barring the covering of tiles—of the same material, the weight and amount of the débris would be comparatively inconsiderable, and would in Anglo-Saxon times leave the pavements upon which it had fallen partially open to inspection. That the Anglo-Saxons were acquainted with the Roman pavements appears matter of just inference. That the Romans had a timber architecture subsidiary to their permanent work in stone we know from the wall-paintings of Pompeii, and certain forms of Romanesque architecture evidently drawn from timber construction, as is shown by Mr. Fergusson in his "History of Architecture." The Anglo-Saxons endeavoured to build *more Romano*, upon the Roman model, and in their work, even more markedly than in other Romanesque or

debased Roman, we find forms imitated from timber construction. And the timber construction they appear to us to have imitated, as evidenced in particular by the very remarkable tower at Earl's Barton, in Northamptonshire, was that half-timbered construction, the use of which survives in some parts of England to the present day—that, viz., in which a timber framework is filled in with brick or tile. This is very distinctly represented by the stonework at Earl's Barton, with its raised and depressed surfaces. We shall not, therefore, perhaps, greatly err in supposing that the Romans were masters of a half-timbered construction, and that the upper portions of the walls in their villas were so formed. If this were the case, we can readily understand how when the timber decayed the upper walls would fall down, and from the unbinding of the roofs, as frequently as not outwards, away from the substructure, which would remain intact and level at the top. It may, however, be said that the Anglo-Saxons, probably, merely imitated their own timber buildings. But we cannot attribute to them, at the date of their arrival in England, or indeed for a long time afterwards, timber buildings above the character of mere huts, and the timber construction imitated in their stone buildings is not of that character. We believe them to have derived their more ambitious timber construction from the Roman remains in Britain, and thence immediately, or mediately, through their own timber buildings, formed upon that model, to have given that character of being derived from a wooden prototype which has been so frequently remarked upon, to their work in stone.

It is much to be regretted that we have no sufficient data for the restoration of the elevations of Roman edifices in this country. That of the temple of Sul-Minerva at Bath has been attempted—perhaps successfully—by Lysons. If he is correct, it may be remarked that the frieze was altogether wanting from its entablature, and indeed we may suppose that Roman architecture in a remote province would deflect not a little from its classical purity. In this it may but have gained the more in force and spontaneity, and herein we may see a further probability that the architecture of the Romans in this country and of the Romanized Britons would furnish a model for the sacred and secular edifices of their successors. It may be remarked finally, in support of what has been adduced above, that the Roman method of heating apartments by means of a subterranean hypocaust, from which the heated air passed upwards by means of flues formed by flanged tiles, whilst militating severely against the supposition that the upper part of the walls was composed wholly of wood, is little if at all inimical to the suggestion that they were partly formed of it, as the wooden beams could be shielded by tiles and thereby secured against any probable risk of catching fire.

There is a very observable peculiarity in Roman houses in

Britain, and to which the Roman villa at Bignor furnishes no exception, that one of the rooms has a semicircular recess or alcove resembling in plan the apse of a small church, such as that of St. Margaret's oratory in the Castle of Edinburgh, or such as we have frequently seen—one in a ruined condition—in the smaller churches of the Northumbrian border. And to a religious purpose Mr. T. Wright would devote this recess in the Roman villas. There is generally where the alcove joins the room an advancing projecting wall or pier, as though a curtain had been drawn across from pier to pier, and the alcove secluded from the body of the apartment. In a suburban villa excavated at Leicester, a short pillar was found lying upon the tessellated pavement of the recess, and this, Mr. Wright thinks, may have served for an altar, or to support a small statue of the patron divinity of the family. Mr. Wright would, however, appear to advance this opinion in ignorance, or in some forgetfulness, of what can be brought against it from the very well-known source of that description of Pliny's Laurentinum, the opening sentences of which have been given above. In that description the following passage occurs:—"There adjoins this angle a small chamber curved in the form of an apse (*in apsida curvatum*) into some of the windows of which the sun perpetually shines. In its wall is an aumbry wrought into a kind of library enclosing books rather for reading again and again than simply for reading." The oval-shaped apartment here described was then a library and not an oratory, and we should require a very strong inference, or rather a direct positive proof, that the apsidal recess was a chapel in any given case. At Bignor the pavement of the recess has a nimbed head of Venus, and this may at first sight appear favourable to Mr. Wright's hypothesis. But it is to be considered that this figure falls into the general decorative scheme of the whole apartment, and that its very position indicates that it was not an object of worship, whilst conclusively proving that an altar or pillar supporting a statue did not occupy that site. Further, what proof is there that the figure that Mr. Wright supposes was placed upon the pedestal at Leicester was that of a divinity? If we suppose the recess to have been a library, such a pedestal may have been placed there for a lamp, when the circling sun had completed its course round the windows. Roman lamps of varied forms may be seen in the fifth (supplementary) volume of Montfaucon's "Antiquité Expliquée."

In concluding our notes upon the Roman villa at Bignor, we desire to draw attention to the very interesting and suggestive comparison drawn in the late Professor Spalding's "Italy and the Italians" (vol. i. p. 175) between the plan of a Roman *Villa Rustica* and that of a monastery with its spreading courts. We were forcibly reminded of it when lately viewing the immense

cloisters and groups of independent yet united edifices, now being erected by the Carthusian Fathers, near Cowfold.

Fragments of Roman pottery have been discovered in the parish of Sutton, which adjoins that of Bignor to the north-west.

Four years later than the more important discovery at Bignor, the remains of an hypocaust were found near the church at Duncton, a parish rendered conspicuous by its possession of Duncton Beacon, the eminence that forms so remarkable an object in the view southward from the high grounds about Fittleworth and Petworth. The building stood north and south. At the south was a room paved with tiles, in which the flue was heated. Dallaway conjectures that the hypocaust belonged to a Roman military bath, such as were placed near the great roads for the accommodation of the soldiers. Certainly the building was more *en bloc* than is usual in the widely spaced out Roman villas, the heating apparatus very complete, and the fact that, whilst fragments of painted stucco were discovered, there were no *tesserae* from mosaic pavements, points rather to its having been such a plain utilitarian building as a bath rather than a villa. It is lamentable to have to relate that since their discovery nothing has been preserved of these remains.

Rather more than six miles south from Bignor, a Roman sepulchre was discovered at Avisford, in the parish of Walberton, at the distance of seven miles from Chichester on the road to Arundel. A workman repeatedly struck with his crowbar upon a hard object that proved to be a stone chest, four feet in length, and one foot eight inches in breadth. It was filled with various vessels of a coarse red pottery, including two earthen basons placed in saucers; fifteen plates, six of a larger and nine of a smaller size; two earthen candlesticks, six inches high; two globe-shaped jugs, eight inches in diameter, with handles and exceedingly narrow necks; and another jug of similar dimensions, but with a wider orifice. Besides these, there were a circular saucer with an engrailed border, containing a smooth oval pebble about the size of a pigeon's egg; another saucer containing a hard round black stone; a third with an oyster-shell, and a thin glass lachrymatory, with two small glass handles. Four of the smaller dishes contained fragments of bone. In the centre of this group of ancient pottery stood a square glass bottle, twelve inches in height and eight in breadth, of a clear sea-green colour, nearly filled with calcined bones, with a handle with ruder mouldings attached to one of its sides and to the narrow circular neck. In the corners, at one end of the coffer, two brackets supported earthen lamps. On the floor of the chest, at the farther end from the lamps, were a pair of tiny sandals studded with hexagonal-headed nails of brass. The sandals were the only objects that showed signs of the decaying touch of

time. A similar discovery to this at Avisford was made at Donnington, near Chichester, when the workmen were engaged in constructing the now abandoned Arun and Portsmouth canal, in 1819. Formerly preserved and shown to visitors in the entrance-lodge to Avisford House, the Avisford coffer may now be seen in the Museum of the Philosophical Society at Chichester. An account of a similar deposit at the Bartlow graves in Essex will be found in the 25th volume of the *Archæologia*.

With the account of this affecting memorial of pre-Christian times, we close our record of them, and come to the light of Saxon Christianity, here identified in its first beginnings with the Apostolate of St. Wilfrid, during his second exile. The list ordinarily given of Saxon churches in Sussex is: Bishopstone Church; the tower of the Church at Bosham; St. Botolph, chancel arch; Burwash; Sompting, chiefly the tower; Worth, part of Church; Yaptown. Of these, St. Botolph's and Sompting alone stand within our special district, but we would fain add to the enumeration Hardham and Selham. Of these Sompting is the most deserving of observation. The church stands in a very beautiful situation on the slope of the Downs, at a distance of three miles from Worthing, in a north-easterly direction. It is surrounded by elm-trees, from which the visitor observes with interest a tower peeping forth, of a form such as is met with nowhere else in this country, though his travels may have made him very familiar with it on the banks of the Rhine and the Lahn. Approaching the church, the visitor finds it, notwithstanding its small dimensions, a cathedral in miniature, cruciform in plan, with nave, chancel, and transepts all complete. The tower is situated at the west end of the fabric. Against it on the north are the remains of a chapel, that may either have had a distinct appropriation, or simply have served as the north aisle. On the east side of the north transept is an isle of two bays, anciently divided into two separate chapels, whilst adjoining the south transept on the east side is a small single chapel, now used as a baptistry. The principal entrance is at the end of the south transept. In the chancel is an altar-tomb that doubtless served, according to the Sarum rite, as the Easter sepulchre, with the arms of the ancient and now extinct Sussex family of Tregoz. Each side of the tower ends in a pointed gable, from which rises the shingled spire, set diagonally to the faces. In this tower may be seen specimens of the "long-and-short work," the timbers, like flat pilasters, and the small windows that are universally regarded as characteristic of Saxon work. But let us not be too certain. It is regarded as evident by Hussey, that the tower is the work of two epochs. The upper part has ornaments that would seem rather Norman than Saxon, and the central rib that

appears on each face of the tower varies in the upper from the contour in the lower portion. The spire was lowered, according to Cartwright, in 1762, by so much as twenty-five feet. There is a figure of our Lord, in the act of benediction, on the exterior of the north transept, and that of a bishop in the same act in the south. This figure is twenty inches in height, and is beneath a semi-circular arch. At the east end of the church internally is some curious interlaced work to which antiquaries generally seem agreed in assigning a Saxon date. We have thus Saxon, or at least very early work, at every one of the four extremities of the building, and we are drawn to the conclusion that the shell of it may be to a considerable extent Saxon, whilst the lower portion of tower is undoubtedly so. It may also be said that other antiquaries do not share Hussey's scruples with regard to the upper part of the tower, but claim for the Saxon period the window openings with their boltels or convex mouldings. To the Saxon period undoubtedly belongs the tower-arch with the carved capitals of its piers exhibiting a strange intermixture of forms derived from the Ionic volute and some foliated, perhaps Corinthian, capital. To the same period belongs the peculiar ornamented string-course of the exterior.

It is a singular theory of Mr. Fergusson with reference to Anglo-Saxon architecture, that it became progressively worse from increasing imitation of timber construction. He happily provides us with ready-charged material for his own demolition by showing in the very ancient doorway at Monkwearmouth the unmistakable imitation of wooden forms. Gothic architecture in England declined owing to the imitation of timber construction in stone, but that was at a period when architecture had attained a very advanced development, and was worked out very much as a problem, and an attenuation of bulk and a superficial fritter of ornament—what Sir Christopher Wren contemptuously called the crinkle-crankle of the [late] Gothic style—was the result. Here we have no parallel to the depravation of Saxon architecture; indeed, what evidence is there that Anglo-Saxon architecture ever declined? It yielded, no doubt, to the advance of the more developed and majestic Norman style, but both must, from the necessity of the case, have been wrought out for a time by the same hands, and there is no good evidence to show that the one is not the perfectly legitimate development of the other. In truth, to parody and reverse Mr. Fergusson's observations, as in India, in Syria, in Egypt, and in Greece, so in England, a wooden, or rather—as we have suggested in an earlier part of this article—a half-timbered construction was gradually developed into one of stone.

ALEXANDER WOOD, F.S.A.

ART. II.—METHODS OF HISTORICAL INQUIRY.

1. *Comparative Politics*. By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D. London: Macmillan & Co. 1873.
2. *Ancient Law*. By Sir H. MAINE. Sixth Edition. London: John Murray. 1876.
3. *Village Communities in the East and West*. By the same. Third Edition. Same Publisher. 1876.
4. *An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent*. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D. Fourth Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1874.
5. *The Study of Sociology*. By HERBERT SPENCER. London: Williams & Norgate. 1874.

IN the present Essay we offer a few remarks on various methods which have been pursued in historical investigation. Let us first settle our terms. The term *method*, used in the sense of method of inquiry, has at least three meanings, of all of which we have availed ourselves. It may mean simply the subjective attitude or posture of the inquirer, which is the statical sense of the term. Or it may mean the manner in which the mind, in its active search after truth, deals with or handles a given subject-matter, as when we speak of the analytic and the synthetic method. Or, thirdly, it may denote the general path or course which the mind traverses in any particular inquiry. This is determined by the starting-point which is begun by being assumed. In this sense the term is used when, in philosophy, we speak of the ontological and the psychological method. Next, as to the term *history*, it is to be observed that this word has two meanings; for historical facts are of two kinds—the veritable fact such as it actually occurred, and the account of it which has been given by more or less competent writers. The first is irrecoverable. It is the second that the historical inquirer has to deal with; and in doing so he has a twofold office to discharge—he has to collect his material correctly, and he has to distinguish in that material reality from misrepresentation. Again, historical facts do not mean simply the current events of the day, but include beliefs, customs, institutions, even forms of language. History is not to be considered as principally made up of the rise and fall of Governments, the shifting of frontier lines, wars of succession, and the like. These do not even give us the salient lines or contour of history, but are rather the frame in which history is set. They are the shell rather than the kernel of history. They are the staple of the drum-and-trumpet histories with which the shelves of libraries are packed.

I.

We will first say a word on what is called the Comparative Method.* Mr. Freeman does not hesitate to call the establishment of this method the greatest intellectual achievement of this century, and a contribution to the advance of human knowledge at least as momentous as the revival of learning of the fifteenth century. It has supplied an *organon* by which moral certainty may be attained in regions before shrouded from the eye of the inquirer. "The characteristic difficulty of the historian," says Sir Henry Maine, "is that recorded evidence, however sagaciously it may be examined and re-examined, can very rarely be added to."[†] It is here that the Comparative Method comes to his assistance, by supplying to matters in which external testimony gives him little or no help, a form of strictly internal proof, which is even more unerring. By this means an entirely new world is revealed to the historical inquirer. And more—the knowledge thus acquired by him throws a completely new light on the previous knowledge derived from historical records, by enabling him to see more truly the nature and comparative importance of the facts recorded. The method has not only gone a long way towards restoring the faded colours of history, but has also, so to say, altered its perspective.

The chief use of the Comparative Method is that it enables us to trace to a common origin beliefs, customs, institutions and forms of language distributed through distant ages and nations. This it has in a large measure enabled us to do for that great family of races to which the common name of Aryan or Indo-European has been given. The great preliminary step was effected by Comparative Philology, which, by a corollary from its own more immediate conclusions, established the common parentage of the Aryan races. This accomplished, the next step was to apply the method to the study of the beliefs and usages which characterize, or have characterized, those races, in order to discover which of them are referable to a common source. And it is to be especially noted that to trace a number of beliefs and usages to a common source, is clearly, in addition, to throw very great light on their history as given in records. For, when once they have been shown to have a common descent, this connection enables them to aid immensely in explaining each other's course, by disclosing missing links or revealing the significance of half-obliterated traces of past ideas or customs; often one of the

* Mr. Fowler says that the Comparative Method is really what is called in Inductive Logic the Method of Concomitant Variations ("Inductive Logic," p. 190).

[†] Maine, "Village Communities," p. 7.

things compared affording the key to some intricate puzzle which would otherwise have remained insolvable. Thus the Comparative Method shades into the Historical Method.

We may here observe that, in comparative inquiry, a most important factor is direct observation of such ideas and customs still existing among Aryan races as have not yet passed beyond a very early stage of development; which are, in other words, arrested growths. They not only aid the inquirer in establishing common descent, but throw immense light on the past history of ideas and customs; for we are enabled to infer the past form of beliefs and usages from examples yet surviving at the present time. In the East we see societies full of arrested growths. Here the Past is brought directly under our eyes. In the light of the Comparative Method, indeed, Past and Present, Ancient and Modern, have acquired a new and a truer meaning. For, firstly, that method, by disclosing an unbroken continuity in history from times for which we have no historical records down to the present, has broken down the artificial party-wall which had been set up between so-called "ancient" and "modern" times. It has, further, shown that the "ancients" are not to be confined to the Greeks and Romans. It has revealed a new world in which tongues and nations that before seemed entirely unconnected, now find their true places, side by side, as "members of one common primæval brotherhood."* And more, it points to societies existing at present in the East, which are in the true sense of the term ancient, as being full of social phenomena strongly resembling like phenomena that can be shown to have characterized the West in times here belonging chronologically to the Past.†

The greatest triumphs of the Comparative Method have been achieved in the science of Comparative Philology. By a close examination of the words of many languages, the philologist, under the guidance of those laws of phonetic change at work in speech which that examination gradually discloses to him, is enabled to establish the affinity of a large number of languages, spoken by peoples scattered over a great part of the earth's surface—the most famous branches of the human family—and to infer thence that these languages were once one language, and, as a direct consequence of this, that the peoples who speak them were once one people. By an incidental corollary, he thus makes a most important contribution to Ethnology. To another subject he also renders a signal service—that of Pre-historic Culture. If—

* Freeman, "Unity of History" (Rede Lecture, now incorporated with "Comparative Politics"), p. 302.

† Maine, "Village Communities," p. 13.

to take an example—he find the word *mill*, or some word clearly the same, used in the same sense in a number of isolated languages of the Aryan family, he is justified in concluding that the word was one of the original Aryan stock of words, and that, therefore, the original Aryan people, from which the later Aryan peoples are all descended, did not part asunder till they had found out the art of grinding. By the same process he concludes that they knew the arts of ploughing, building houses, making boats, that they could reckon up to a hundred, that they had domesticated the most important animals, that they knew and could work several important metals, that they recognized the fundamental relations of blood and marriage, &c.* He can go on further and show, by the evidence of language, how other steps in the progress of culture were taken independently by different branches of the common stock after their separation, and even in some cases assign the particular stage in the Aryan dispersion at which those steps were taken.

In Comparative Philology the Comparative Method is self-convincing. The doctrine of a common derivation is the only possible explanation here. It would be hard, for instance, to suppose that “by sheer chance, without any connection of any kind with each other, a large number of isolated nations separately made up their minds to call a mill a mill.† And when we find, not one or two, but many things called by the same name in a number of languages, we have no alternative but to infer the common descent of those languages. But the application of the method is not nearly so ready in any other branch of inquiry. Take Comparative Mythology. Besides the fact that it is much more difficult to establish a likeness between one legend and another than it is to show the identity between two cognate words, there is, in the case of legends which seem to be common to distant ages and nations, the possible alternative that they may be independent creations wrought out *after* the Aryan dispersion. It is only, indeed, when Comparative Philology comes to its help that Comparative Mythology begins to yield anything like certain results; that is, when there is shown to be a philological connection between names that appear in like legends; though even then there is the chance that the connection is nothing more than philological. In any case, the Comparative Method, as in the study of language, is the only scientific method here.

There is next the comparative study of Customs. The two

* Max Müller, “Science of Language,” p. 235; Peile, “Philology,” pp. 66, 67.

† Freeman, “Comparative Politics,” p. 6.

branches already touched on render valuable assistance to the inquirer in this department. His business is with rites and usages, which he not only traces upwards to a common source, but traces downwards till they appear as mere "survivals," a process which the inquirer in other branches of Comparative Study may likewise perform. By this process an inflection or termination, a nursery tale, a proverb, a familiar gesture, that seem quite meaningless, become instinct with meaning by being connected backwards with primitive belief. In the study of customs the Comparative Method is still less safe than in the case of Comparative Mythology. Like customs found in times and countries far apart may have had a common origin; but then they may be instances of like effects following upon like circumstances, or simply offsprings of a common idea; or again, there is the alternative of one nation having borrowed a custom from another. There is little room to doubt that many of the most essential arts of civilized life—as printing, writing, the use of the arch and the dome, the use of the mill, the use of the bow, the taming of the horse, the hollowing out of the canoe—have been found out again and again in distant times and countries. To be able to infer a common derivation from the common possession of such inventions, some other sign of historical connection, philological or otherwise, must be visible.* But in any case, the Comparative Method is the only scientific method to be followed in the study of customs.

Mr. Freeman has endeavoured to apply the method to a fourth branch, which he calls Comparative Politics, by which he means the comparative study of political institutions or forms of government. He considers that the method "in this inquiry is further off than in any of the others, from being the one universal solvent." He examines other alternative explanations, in the case of like political institutions, than that of a common origin. Firstly, the likeness between any two institutions may be due to direct transmission from one to the other. This may be either direct transplantation, as, for instance, the reproduction of English political institutions in the subjugated country of Ireland, or the establishment by the Crusaders of the most perfect system of feudal law in the Assizes of the Christian Kingdom of Jerusalem; or maybe simple imitation as, for instance, the deliberate imitation of the constitution of the English Parliament in most of the legislative assemblies of Europe. Secondly, there is the alternative that the likeness may be simply an instance of like causes producing like effects. A case of likeness between political institutions arising from transmission or imitation is not as a rule hard to discern, as the connection

* "Comparative Politics," pp. 31, 32.

in such cases is mostly a matter of recorded history or of immediate inference therefrom. But the second alternative presents more difficulty.

But (says Mr. Freeman) when we see nations which have been, during the historic times, more or less widely parted off from one another, but which are proved by the evidence of language to be scattered colonies of a common stock—when, among nations like these, we find in their political institutions the same kind of likenesses which we find in their languages and their mythology—the obvious inference is that the likeness in all these cases is due to the same cause. That is to say, the obvious inference is, that there was a time when these now parted nations formed one nation, and that, before they parted asunder, the common forefathers of both had made certain advances in political life, had developed certain common political institutions, traces or developments of which are still to be seen in the political institutions of the now isolated nations.*

And when there is the corroborative evidence of language, when in two nations we find a common institution called by a common name, the explanation of a common origin may be given without any hesitation; though the absence of such a common name by no means disproves a common derivation, as the details of political vocabulary would be worked out independently long after the dispersion. Many important and interesting results have been arrived at by Mr. Freeman. How interesting, for instance, to find that “the Ekklesia of Athens, the Comitia of Rome, and the Parliament of England, are all offshoots from one common stock,” and that “Kleisthenês, Licinius, and Simon de Montfort were fellow-workers in one common cause!”†

The Comparative Method has been applied by Sir Henry Maine in this country with great success to the study of Jurisprudence, more especially to the study of the institution of Property.‡ His most important conclusions are drawn from observations made in India, a country which, he says, has given to the world Comparative Philology and Comparative Mythology, and may yet give us a science of Comparative Jurisprudence. We may here just notice that Sir Henry Maine is of opinion that the village community of India, which is known to be of immense antiquity, is the one which, above all other things, should be carefully examined by any one who is in search of the early condition of property. This is at once, he says, “an organized

* “Comparative Politics,” pp. 34, 35.

† Freeman, “Unity of History,” p. 338 (in “Comparative Politics”).

‡ In his “Village Communities in the East and West” and “Early History of Institutions.”

patriarchal society and an assemblage of co-proprietors," in which "the personal relations to each other of the men who compose it are indistinguishably confounded with their proprietary rights."* Comparing the Indian village community with forms of the village community yet existing in Europe, he concluded that this kind of ownership represents the ancient form of property. He has more recently extended and confirmed his conclusions on this subject by a study of the translations of the "Ancient Laws of Ireland," lately published at the expense of the Irish Government, which supply us with an immense amount of information about ancient Celtic communities.

II.

We will next very briefly take notice of some methods of historical inquiry which must be deemed erroneous. First, there is the error of attempting to deduce the psychological from the logical order. One instance of this shall suffice, and it shall be taken from the history of language. How was the grammar of language elaborated? For instance, were adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, which are logically distinct parts of speech, independently formed, or were they wrought out by derivation from some other part or parts of speech, as the noun or pronoun, with which they have no logical connection? Mr. Peile writes as follows:—

Grammarians have begun by laying down the modes in which men must think, and then proceeded to find in speech the necessary exponents of these modes. Thus, for example, it has been maintained that the instrumental case was invented to express the conception of a cause already present in the mind; the dative to denote operation; and so on. This is a great error. It may be conceded that some of the essentials of thought, subject and predicate as we have already seen, must find their exponents, whether separate or compounded together, in every sentence. But beyond this, logic should be kept out of grammar. Grammar has its 'categories,' its forms to express the 'whence' and the 'where,' &c.; but these do not coincide with the logical categories, and they must be discovered in a way independent of these, from the language itself. Every language has its guiding principles; and we can often give the reason why it has taken this or that particular form; when we cannot, we believe that there is some cause, though we in our ignorance cannot say what it is, as we saw when we were considering the origin of the cases. We could recover their earliest form and their earliest use, but the cause, why that particular form was chosen for that particular use, was beyond our grasp. But that cause is never a compulsory one; there is no *must* in the matter. We saw reason to believe that many different forms would

* "Ancient Law," p. 260.

do equally well for the same use. Then out of many possible forms of expression some one secures acceptance by its greater suitability, real or apparent. The fittest form makes its way into general use.*

He has concluded that, for the most part, adverbs and prepositions are historically cases of nouns; while of conjunctions he concludes that a mass of them are obviously cases, generally of pronouns.

A common error in the works of historical inquirers is the viewing the past in the light of the ideas and usages existing at their own time.† Thus, names which once denoted things no longer in existence, either present no meaning to them at all, or are rendered by some fancied modern equivalent. Names, again, whose connotations have really undergone much alteration with the evolution of social ideas, are thought always to have denoted the same, or much the same, things. And acts and institutions are criticised by them, not by reference to contemporary beliefs, opinions, feelings, and forms of life, but in the light of modern ideas. When *Themistes* are spoken of in Homer, it is fancied that they must mean judicial decisions made in accordance with a system of regular law; whereas they can be shown to represent an idea anterior to that of law, or even to that of custom, and to mean simply awards held to be delivered by the king under the direct inspiration of Themis.‡ On the change of meaning in terms the following may be quoted from Sir H. Maine's "Ancient Law":—

It may here be observed that we know enough of ancient Roman

* "Philology," pp. 138, 139.

† Mr. Mill thus describes a rather extreme type of this class of historians:—"They assume that words mean the same thing to a monkish chronicler as to a modern Member of Parliament. If they find the term *rex* applied to Clovis or Clotaire, they already talk of 'the French monarchy' or 'the kingdom of France.' If among a tribe of savages, newly escaped from the woods, they find mention of a council of leading men or an assembled multitude giving its sanction to some matter of general concernment, their imagination jumps to a system of free institutions and a wise contrivance of constitutional balances and checks. If, at other times, they find a chief killing and plundering without this sanction, they just as promptly figure to themselves an acknowledged despotism." But he adds: "Humble as our estimate must be of this kind of writers, it would be unjust to forget that even *their* mode of treating history is an improvement upon the uninquiring credulity which contented itself with copying or translating the ancient authorities without ever bringing the writer's own mind in contact with the subject. It is better to conceive Demosthenes even under the image of Anacharsis Clootz, than not as a living being at all, but a figure in a puppet-show, of which Plutarch is the showman; and Mitford, so far, is a better historian than Rollin."—*Dissertations and Discussions*, vol. ii. pp. 126, 127.

‡ Maine, "Ancient Law," pp. 4, 5.

law to give some idea of the mode of transformation followed by legal conceptions and by legal phraseology in the infancy of Jurisprudence. The change which they undergo appears to be a change from general to special ; or, as we might otherwise express it, the ancient conceptions and the ancient terms are subjected to a process of gradual specialization. An ancient legal conception corresponds not to one, but to several modern conceptions. An ancient technical expression serves to indicate a variety of things which in modern law have separate names allotted to them. If, however, we take up the history of Jurisprudence at the next stage, we find that the subordinate conceptions have gradually disengaged themselves, and that the old general names are giving way to special appellations. The old general conception is not obliterated, but it has ceased to cover more than one or a few of the notions which it first included. So too the old technical name remains, but it discharges only one of the functions which it once performed.

This process is exemplified in the history of Contract and Conveyance in Roman law :—

There seems to have been one solemn ceremonial at first for all solemn transactions, and its name at Rome appears to have been *nexum*. Precisely the same forms which were in use when a conveyance of property was effected seem to have been employed in the making of a contract. But we have not very far to move onwards before we come to a period at which the notion of a contract has disengaged itself from the notion of a conveyance. A double change has thus taken place. The transaction with the copper and the balance, when intended to have for its office the transfer of property, is known by the new and special name of Mancipation. The ancient *Nexum* still designates the same ceremony, but only when it is employed for the special purpose of solemnizing a contract.*

Thus, contrary to all our modern notions, there was a time when the two ideas of Contract and Conveyance had not been differentiated. A mind unable to divest itself of modern conceptions would clearly be unfitted for tracing such a change in the history of legal ideas. Much of the "rehabilitating" tendency so much in fashion among modern historical writers comes under the present head. We will just note that certain special tendencies and mental characteristics of our own times may draw us with peculiar force to certain past characters, and lead us to "rehabilitate" them. In doing so, we may be led to unclothe them of the characteristics which connect them with the ideas and feelings of their age. A "great man" of past times may thus come to be invested by a powerful writer in an entirely false garb, which may for a very long time, perhaps always, cling to him. The forms which this second error of viewing the past in

* "Ancient Law," pp. 316-318.

the light of the present assumes are extremely various, but want of space prevents us from being able to enter further than we have done into illustration.

A third error exhibited in historical inquiry may be noted, which is that of entering on it with narrow or erroneous aims or preconceptions. This will clearly lead an inquirer to misconceive, and therefore to misrepresent, the comparative value and significance both of things which fall in with, and of things which make against, his view. Even so great an historian as Mr. Grote was led, by his Radical principles, and his consequent desire to exhibit the operation of those principles to the best advantage, unduly to extol the Athenian Constitution: witness his elaborate vindication of Cleon, the personification of Athenian Demagogy, which took his readers so much by surprise; and his palliation of the condemnation of Socrates, which he regards as almost pardonable. As a contrast to the picture of the Athenian democracy drawn by the Radical Grote, the equally prejudiced representation of it by the Tory Mitford may be referred to in illustration of the error to which we allude. We suppose that few would regard Mr. Froude's attempt to vindicate English rule in Ireland as anything but a systematic effort to shape history in accordance with a preconception. The same may be said of his apology for Henry VIII., of whom (to take one example) he does not hesitate to say that he beheaded Anne Boleyn one day and married Jane Seymour next day from the strictest sense of public duty. Mr Freeman says: "Mr. Froude's flattering picture comes hardly nearer to the real man than the vulgar Bluebeard portrait of which he very rightly complains."* In the same article he says: "The very first words of Mr. Froude's 'Life and Times of Thomas Becket' are enough to show us that the seeming historical inquiry is really designed as a manifesto against a theological party which once numbered its author among its members."†

We will conclude this part of our subject by just mentioning two other forms of error in historical inquiry. In the study of history we may clearly err on the side of credulity or on the side of incredulity. As an extreme illustration of the latter error may be noticed the reckless way in which the so-called German Theological School, such as Strauss and Baur, have treated the Four Gospels, substituting for written tradition the most gratuitous hypotheses; the former of which they treat as

* *Contemporary Review*, "Mr. Froude's 'Life and Times of Thomas Becket.'" By Edward A. Freeman, D.C.L., LL.D. I. March, 1878. P. 823.

† *Ibid.*, p. 822.

though it were hardly to be reckoned among the *momenta* of proof at all.* Lastly, it is obviously an unsound mode of procedure to introduce *à priori* methods into historical investigation.

In modern times (writes Sir H. Maine) many other considerations have had priority over truth. During the last century in France, which then had unquestionably the intellectual headship of Europe, it was a common opinion that history would be of no value unless it illustrated certain general propositions assumed or believed to be proved *à priori*. The tendency in England, the effect of that interest which is the keenest of all interests in Englishmen, their interest in politics, has been to make historians regard history as pre-eminently an instructress in the art of government, and specially as charged with illustrating the principles of that branch of the art of which Englishmen are masters, the art of constitutional government. But quite recently a manifest dissatisfaction has shown itself with all these schools of history.†

To take a very extreme illustration under this head, two celebrated *à priori* attempts have been made to discover the origin of society—those of Hobbes and Rousseau. Hobbes asserted that men were originally in a state of war, and that they at some time or other formed a compact, by which every one gave up his powers of aggression, lodging all power in the hands of a sovereign, whence resulted law, peace, and order. Rousseau also assumed an original state of Nature, but, unlike that of Hobbes, it was a perfect state, in which all were equal, inequality being, he maintained, the baneful effect of the passage from the State of Nature to the Social State. Both these accounts are of course worthless.

* Strauss banished the Four Gospels from the domain of history altogether, treating them as nothing more than collections of myths or fables. These, he affirmed, originated in two sources—the notions already existing as to the attributes of the Messiah, and the peculiar mode of action adopted by Our Lord. The ideas which thus fastened on the minds of his followers developed more and more, till, in the second or third century, the prevalent beliefs were committed to writing in the shape of the present Gospels. Baur assumed an early struggle between the Jewish Christians, or followers of St. Peter, and the Gentile Christians, or followers of St. Paul. The Gospels, he said, were formed by successive developments; on the conclusion of the struggle the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, as being too Judaizing, and the Gospel of Luke, as adhering too much to Pauline doctrines, suffering correction. This is the theory of many of the Tübingen School. For further illustrations read Lamy's "Examen de la Vie de Jésus de M. Renan," 1871, and his "Les Apôtres," 1874.

† "Village Communities" (Address to the University of Calcutta), p. 265.

III.

We will next, in the briefest manner possible, take notice of some of the principal subjective sources of disturbance or perversion in historical investigation. The subjective hindrances to the normal action of the mental powers in historical inquiry are so various that it will be hardly possible, within the limits at our disposal, to do more than just refer to some of them, the reader being left to find suitable illustrations for himself.

(1) While the *imagination* is of great service to the historical inquirer in helping him to realize vividly the past, and even to restore the faded colours of history, it is also a source of much disturbance. First, there is the *too highly constructive* imagination, which easily and rapidly forms representations or pictures of past events, in which either the grouping is incorrect or the colours are too vividly restored. Then there is the *artistic* imagination, which is often unable in the study of past events to resist the impulse to form artistic pictures, by outlining, sketching in, projecting backgrounds, bringing out lights and shades, in accordance with certain artistic requirements. There is, too, the tendency experienced by many to "sublimate" (if we may use the expression) past transactions, characters, or institutions—to "poetize" the past, in accordance with the well-known lines—

Distance lends enchantment to the view,
And clothes its mountains in her azure hue.

The action of the imagination is concerned also in that longing after ideal harmony in Nature and history which make a certain class of minds what is called *optimistic*. Sir H. Maine, in his "Village Communities," thus writes:—

If the question were put, Why should history be studied? the only answer, I suppose, which could be given is, because it is true: because it is a portion of the truth to which it is the object of all study to attain. It is, however, an undoubted fact that the quality of the truth expected from history has always been changing, and cannot be said to be even now settled. Beyond all question, it grew everywhere out of poetry, and long had its characteristics even in the Western World. In the East, as my native auditors know, down to comparatively modern times, the two forms of truth, the poetical and historical form, were incapable of being disentangled from one another. In the West, which alone has seen the real birth and growth of history, long after it ceased to be strictly poetical it continued to be dramatic; and many of the incomparable merits of those historians to whom I see many of the students have been introduced by their recent studies, the great historians of the ancient Western World—as, for example, their

painting and analysis of character—are quite as much due in reality to their sense of dramatic propriety as to their love of pure truth.*

(2) Next, there is the influence of *prejudice*, which may arise from some emotional state requiring for its satisfaction a corresponding set of images and beliefs, or from possession only of one-sided evidence, which has so deeply impressed the mind as very materially to interfere with the admission of other kinds of evidence, or from having constantly come across the same views expressed, the very iteration of which, even when unsupported by evidence, has disposed the mind to receive them. A prejudiced mind is like a prepared ground in which only plants of a certain kind will grow. The following passage, from the article in the *Contemporary Review* to which we have already referred, may be quoted, illustrating the combined effects of prejudice and imagination :—

How deep-set and bitter Mr. Froude's anti-ecclesiastical feelings are is shown by the fact that they are consistent with the fullest artistic perception of whatever is touching and poetic in the ecclesiastical system. Mr. Froude, as a writer, never reaches so high a point as in several passages where he describes various scenes and features of monastic life. To do justice to a bishop or a monk is what Mr. Froude can never bring himself to; but to paint this and that poetic aspect of a bishop or a monk is what few men can do better. Hatred must be fierce indeed which is noway softened by so remarkable a power of merely artistic appreciation. In a student of mediæval history, Mr. Froude's artistic appreciation is undoubtedly no contemptible help; but it will hardly stand in the place of unswerving justice. What the mediæval Church asks from the student of mediæval history is simply justice. And justice will never be done to her either by fanatical votaries or by fanatical enemies. Mr. Froude has tried both characters, and both characters are alike incompatible with justice, incompatible with truth.†

(3) The influence of special *emotional* states might next be referred to. Any very strongly developed feeling, as a keen sense of the ludicrous, a love of the marvellous, or strong attachments to class, party, or country, will, if not provided against, disturb the course of historical inquiry. As an instance of the influence of the sentiment of reverence for embodied power, contrast with the account given of King James by Bisset and other historians, that he was "in every relation of life in which he is viewed . . . equally an object of aversion or contempt," the dedication to him of the English translation of the Bible—

* P. 264 (Address to the University of Calcutta, March, 1865).

† Mr. Froude's "Life and Times of Thomas Becket." By Edward A. Freeman. I. March, 1878. P. 826.

"Great and manifold were the blessings, Most Dread Sovereign, which Almighty God, the Father of all Mercies, bestowed upon us, the people of England, when first he sent Your Majesty's Royal Person to rule and reign over us," &c. &c.*

(4) We should next allude to various kinds of *mental complexion*, which are uncongenial to historical inquiry.

(a) First, there is the *want of mental conceptivity*, the inability adequately to lay hold of, and represent to the mind, the events, so multitudinous and complex, of history. In this case the mind tends to diffuse itself vaguely over the facts, instead of grasping them both individually and as a whole. The events of history being distributed in time and space, a high sense of historical perspective becomes quite necessary. Yet perhaps no error has been so common in historical works as that of confounding together generations or successive states of humanity, or, again, of mis-estimating the varying rates at which influences have been able to travel over space at different periods. Mr. Mill, writing on M. Michelet's "History of France," says—

The great value of the book is, that it does, to some extent, make us understand what was really passing in the collective mind of each generation. For, in assuming distinctness, the life of the past assumes also variety under M. Michelet's hands. With him each period has a physiognomy and a character of its own. It is in reading him that we are made to feel distinctly how many successive conditions of humanity, and states of the human mind, are habitually confounded under the appellation of the Middle Ages. To common perception, those times are like a distant range of mountains, all melted together into one cloudlike barrier. To M. Michelet they are like the same range, on a nearer approach, resolved into its separate mountain masses, with sloping sides overlapping one another, and gorges opening between them.†

Waiving the question of the real merits or demerits of M. Michelet's work, this passage well illustrates our meaning.

(b) Secondly, there is the *want of mental plasticity* the want of power to enter into and realize situations, combinations, and types of character, different from those with which the inquirer is familiar. Most men's ideas have been framed out of observations made within more or less narrow areas; and ideas so framed are much too deeply imbedded to permit ready admittance to the combinations of facts presented by past social states,

* Spencer, "Study of Sociology," pp. 175, 176.

† Mill, "Dissertations and Discussions," vol. ii. pp. 141, 142. Mr. Spencer, in his "Study of Sociology," says that "the habits of thought generated by converse with relatively simple phenomena partially unfit for converse with the highly complex phenomena" presented by society (p. 73).

societies alien in race, or races in early stages of development. Again, in endeavouring to interpret past human conduct, it is difficult to enter into thoughts and motives different from one's own, to avoid using on all occasions, as a key to past conduct, one's own nature.* (c) *Want of the critical power.* Historical criticism is two-fold—it is the searching after historical truth, and secondly, the assigning to facts their proper degree of importance relatively to each other and to general history. As to the first, we agree with the main thesis of Cardinal Newman's "Grammar of Assent," that "formal logical sequence is not the method by which we are enabled to become certain of what is concrete," that the method is "the cumulation of probabilities, independent of each other, arising out of the nature and circumstances of the particular case which is under review; probabilities too fine to avail separately, too subtle and circuitous to be convertible into syllogisms, too numerous and various for such conversion even were they convertible,"† that "we grasp the full tale of premisses and the conclusion, *per modum unius*—by a sort of instinctive perception of the legitimate conclusion in and through the premisses, not by a formal juxtaposition of propositions."‡ Of the want of critical judgment in the use of authorities one or two instances will suffice here. Speaking of the work of Thierry, Mr. Freeman says that he uses authorities in the wildest way; he has no idea of the different value of authorities; any book published before printing was invented is to him of equal value with any other book; he puts together pieces taken from different accounts without seeing their mutual inconsistency.§ Speaking of Mr. Froude's proposition, that English history ought to be studied in the Statute-book, he writes: "Mr. Froude had clear-sightedness enough to see at a glance the importance of documentary evidence. But the conviction had to him something of the charm of a discovery; an official proclamation, judgment, assertion of any kind, became in his eyes clothed with a kind of sacred character, before which the ordinary rules of morals and the ordinary rules of historical evidence had to give way. All this could hardly have happened to one who had made history the study of his life."|| The second, besides extended knowledge, requires a philosophic habit of mind, which can perceive the bearings, the vital connections of facts. Mr. Freeman, writing

* To this error is given the name of *automorphic interpretation*.

† Newman, "Grammar of Assent," p. 281.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 294.

§ *Contemporary Review*, "Mr. Froude's 'Life and Times of Thomas Becket.'" September, 1878. P. 239.

|| *Ibid.*, March, 1878. P. 825.

against Mr. Froude's method of treating the life and times of St. Thomas of Canterbury, describes the stand-point from which alone a true comprehension of the subject can be acquired. He says that it is a subject which involves an examination of some of the greatest questions which ever distracted Christianity; it necessitates a comprehension of the characters of some of the greatest men in English history as well as some notice of distinguished men in other countries; it requires an examination of the issues, then maturing, of the Norman Conquest; it demands that we extend our view beyond our own island, for the rule of Henry II. stretched from the Pyrenees to the Cheviots, and his policy embraced all countries from Ireland to the Holy Land; it calls for familiarity with a whole contemporary literature; it needs a further study of the general sources of English history, and indeed of European history; nor will contemporary history in England and abroad suffice, for no one can understand the twelfth century who has not thoroughly made himself master of the eleventh, nor the eleventh who has not a considerable knowledge of the centuries preceding.* Under this head we might add one or two observations. The generality of men are unable to look at more than a very few aspects or sides of a question at a time. Their conclusions are based, not on all the facts or on all the evidence taken together, but on a succession of detached glimpses. They are in consequence either quite erroneous, the true relations of the facts or the cumulative force of the evidence not coming out under such a method of examination, or are else imperfect, being at best a kind of patchwork of truth. Many minds, again, in pursuing an inquiry, are unable to preserve an equable calmness of temper, to hold their judgment in suspense till all the evidence or all the facts have been brought under review. Their conclusions are really formed before the question has been thoroughly investigated. They are specially liable to be overwhelmed by momentary presentation of a mass of evidence or of facts pointing in one direction, and to be thence rendered incapable of recovering their balance. Then there is the action of mental sympathy. In the study of history, the mind, by an unconscious process of assimilation, tends to fasten on and coördinate those particular aspects of the facts which are most congenial to it. These become to it the most striking sides of human history. It may even go on to gather these aspects together, and manipulate them into a theory—its philosophy of history. (d) Where the reason is developed out of proportion to the other, as the imaginative faculties, other forms of erroneous treatment appear. There is, for instance, *the realist mind*, with

* *Contemporary Review*, March, 1878. Pp. 829, 830.

its rage for distinctions and classification. Historical facts get ranged in classes, the *fundamenta divisionis* being readily supplied for them by the mind itself. Things indissolubly connected may then get separated, and referred to different heads; while things, on the other hand, which have little or no vital connection, may come to be classified together. And, further, the facts become starved down into mere notions; a notion has to stand as a shrunken representation of a reality; and thus the figures of history, losing their strong individuality of character, become little more than lay-figures. Secondly, there is the *theorizing propensity*, the tendency to read history by divination, to expound it in the light of views begotten of the mind itself.

Mr. Buckle, in the general introduction to his "History of Civilization," has derived all the distinctive institutions of India and the peculiarities of its people from their consumption of rice. From the fact, he tells us, that the exclusive food of the natives of India is of an oxygenous rather than a carbonaceous character, it follows by an inevitable law that caste prevails, that oppression is rife, that rents are high, and that custom and law are stereotyped.*

Here is a very extreme instance. But let us not be misunderstood. As Mr. Mill observes, it is wrong to suppose that a man of genius will oftener go wrong than "a dull unimaginative proser," and that "there is no perversion of history by persons who think equal to those daily committed by writers who never rise to the height of an original idea."† There have been undoubtedly minds who, with no great erudition, have penetrated with wonderful clearness into the meanings of history, who have, by striking generalizations which they alone could work out, rendered the explanation of intricate or obscure historical movements. Even sometimes minds of really great reach may become so entangled in the facts whose course they are endeavouring to trace as to lose sight altogether of the real underlying current which is hurrying them on to their denouement. If Guizot be right in his explanation of the decline of society which led to the fall of the Roman Empire, that it was due to the over-taxation and thence impoverishment and eventually extinction of the class who made up the respectable inhabitants of the towns, it is quite certain that Gibbon, the historian of the Decline and Fall of the Empire, had entirely lost sight of its real cause.‡

(5) Lastly, there is the influence of man's instrument of thought, *language*. In the first place, language is only an

* Maine, "Village Communities," p. 213.

† Mill, "Dissertations and Discussions," vol. ii. p. 142.

‡ *Ibid.*, vol. ii. (Guizot's Essays and Lectures on History).

imperfect copy or representative of thought; hence much misrepresentation or perversion. And secondly, thought in its course is so bound up with its verbal representative, that the latter exercises an active influence of its own on thought, from which it is very often unable to escape; words, which should be the ministers of thought, thus often becoming its masters. (a) We have already spoken of realism in historical inquiry. This is much promoted by the influence of words. An idea or group of ideas, having found embodiment in a word, seems thereby to acquire a stronger reality; and so, if a conception were at first framed out of a few only of the aspects of that which it was intended to represent, or based on an unimportant *differentia*, the error arising will have acquired a firmer hold by the conception having been enshrined in a word. (b) Again, if words have arisen in erroneous conceptions, the mere fact of their being in the field will cause hosts of facts in the prejudiced mind to congregate under the ideas conveyed by such words, and to be viewed in the light of those ideas—a result of the naturally classificatory nature of the mind. (c) Further, the sharp divisions marked off by words unconsciously lead to a too sharp division of ideas, the quality of the mind just referred to often causing ideas which are mixed in character to be brought under one or other of the simple ideas which the words denote. Thus, an artistic or literary work, which cannot really be classed as entirely “romantic” or entirely “classical,” might come, and indeed often does come, to be spoken of as exclusively one or the other. (d) Another danger arising from the precise character attaching to names is that obscure subjects, when treated of in terms of a technical kind, may come thereby to appear less obscure than they really are. There is, for instance, much speculation now afloat on antiquarian subjects, in which the inquirer appears to himself or to others to be cutting into the heart of a subject, when his weapons are really little more than a set of technical terms. (e) We may perhaps add the disturbing effect on thought and inquiry arising from the mental satisfaction engendered in a writer by neat, concise, or antithetic collocations of words, an influence especially noticeable in French authors; and, connected with this, the influence on an author exerted by the itch after what is called “fine” writing, frequently observable in the works of Macaulay.

No one can be entirely free from all these various sources of error. When all has been done by education or self-restraint to counteract them, the general subjective bent or character of each individual is sure in some way to transform the subject under study. Thus, according as the mind is constructive or sceptical, the interpretation of ancient records may vary extremely. Thus, Niebuhr, in examining the extant records for early Roman

history, considered that prescription, along with internal consistency, was sufficient evidence of fact. He took to pieces what he found in those records, and rearranged it according to certain principles of probability. "We are able," he says, "to trace the history of the Roman constitution back to the beginning of the Commonwealth, as accurately as we wish, and even more perfectly than the history of many portions of the Middle Ages." On the other hand, listen to Sir George Lewis, with whom prescription has no force, and who will receive no evidence which has not first established its right to acceptance. "We may rejoice," he says, "that the ingenuity or learning of Niebuhr should have enabled him to advance many novel hypotheses and conjectures respecting the form and the early constitution of Rome, but unless he can support those hypotheses by sufficient evidence, they are not entitled to our belief."

A word in conclusion on the difficulties under which historians labour in endeavouring to *record* contemporary facts. Historians are peculiarly liable to miss the great movement of their time in the midst of "the full-blown events of the current day." Mr. Carlyle says—

Our clock strikes when there is a change from hour to hour; but no hammer in the horologe of time peals through the universe when there is a change from era to era. Men understand not what is among their hands: as calmness is the characteristic of strength, so the weightiest causes may be most silent. It is, in no case, the real historical transaction, but only some more or less plausible scheme and theory of the transaction, or the harmonized result of many such schemes, each varying from the other and all varying from truth, that we can ever hope to behold.*

Secondly, an historian is apt often to mistake what is really a mere "survival" in customs or institutions in his time for their real essence, or a part thereof. He takes the shadow for the substance. Thirdly, the narrator can observe and record only the *series* of his own experiences. But the events themselves occurred, not in series, but in groups. As Mr. Carlyle puts it, Action is of three dimensions, having length, breadth, and depth; while Narrative is, by its nature, of only one dimension: Narrative is *linear*, Action is *solid*. Lastly, the collector of facts, like the interpreter of records, is exposed to the disturbing influences of imagination, prejudice, feeling, peculiar mental complexion, and language. As to imagination, this has acted with varying degrees of force at different periods, the earlier

* "Miscellaneous Essays," vol. ii. p. 171.

historians being immensely under its sway. Prejudice and feeling also exercise very great influence. Beliefs about the affairs going on around us are warped by education, by patriotism, by class bias, by the bias of political party, by a love of the marvellous, and in a thousand other ways. We might remark that, in examining past historical records of contemporary events, an inquirer ought to gauge, as accurately as possible, the general mental character of the time in which the writers lived, to estimate, for instance, as nearly as possible, the exact degree in which imagination operated in their time. This, which is so often quite overlooked, would be an immense help towards the discrimination between fact and misrepresentation in records.

HENRY WORSLEY.

ART. III.—A FRENCH STUDY OF CHRISTIAN WOMANHOOD.

Les Femmes dans la Société Chrétienne. Par ALPHONSE DANTIER. Paris: Firmin Didot et C^{ie}. 1879.

WHEN an author takes a subject nineteen centuries long, and as wide as the world, it is plain at the outset that, though he may call his work by the whole name of such a subject, the work cannot hope to present any entire view of it, but only an aspect bounded by one mind's horizon, or a detailed review of the narrow track by which the student chose to traverse it in his own research. To give anything like full elaboration would be to load the public with a library instead of a treatise; to attempt a general view of the whole would be to give only a vague impression; to strive after detail and brevity at once would produce something useful and reliable, perhaps, but only as attractive as a map or a table of statistics. In the present instance, there was much tact displayed in surmounting the first difficulty, that of planning a system for treating in short space one of the widest historical subjects. There is not here the vagueness of a merely general view, nor monotonous superabundance of detail. M. Dantier has devised a happy mean for escaping both extremes; for while he gives a passing survey of the spirit and character of each period, he selects from each some individual lives most characteristic of that spirit or most prominent in the history of the time. He tells us in his preface that, while pursuing his studies at the Sorbonne, he was first struck by the impressive fact which, seen from different points, appeared with equal force in the historical teaching both of M. Guizot and

of Frederic Ozanam—namely, the dependence of the progress of the world's civilization upon the religious and the moral influence of the Christian faith. Following out this line of thought, he was led to seek and distinguish the various means by which Providence had accomplished this design; and in the preparation of those former works which are now well known since they have been crowned by the French Academy, out of historical studies of the Ages of Faith arose the conviction that in the progress of civilization a large part had been taken silently and without ostentation by the predestined influence of Christian womanhood. His work has been to depict this influence by analysis of the various periods, and by brief memoirs of representative lives; for he would not only retrace for us the story of the heroines of faith, but, as far as may be done by a critical pen, he would reproduce the atmosphere of their time, and strive to some extent to account for the surrounding circumstances which influenced those who in their turn were to influence the world around them. But he forewarns the reader that in his work there will be nothing didactic. He has no ambition to teach unless the past teaches of itself, nor to be the censor of his time; lest, like so many that would cry down the evils of a present age, he might find that his voice was one crying in the desert. Far from this, he wisely points out that in this our time, even as in the times that have become historic, if there are great evils, there are also to be found great virtues and great merit.

Only (he observes), when one finds men judging and weighing the other sex according to certain dramas and modern novels, it is desirable to show by means of historical proof that if woman has often been by her weakness the source of all evil, she has far oftener been by her virtue the source of all good. And, besides, whatever may be our powerlessness to rise to the heroic heights of Christian perfection, it is always profitable to recall such great memories, if only to raise up again the dignity of human nature by opposing to its unspeakable littleness its unutterable greatness.

With such an end in view, the choice of his heroines was not made in accordance with any worldly rules of historical prominence or personal notoriety.

By preference (he says), I have chosen those whose pure and stainless glory contrasts with the unworthy fame of so many others, who, after having fascinated their time, have fallen back into that dust and oblivion in which it were better to leave them unrecalled.

His heroines are chiefly those humble agents of the Divine Will who simply hoped to pass through this world doing good; and we can well understand the avowal of the author, that while he

studied and retraced such lives, those messengers of Providence, following each other in their humble and unconscious mission, reminded him of the bright processions of saints and martyrs, with palm, and crown, and aureole, which the artists of old have left depicted in the mosaics or the fading frescoes of the sanctuary.

Before passing in review this long procession of heroines of the centuries, and contrasting the spirit of the Church with the spirit of the world to-day, we would point out the one truth which has been impressed upon us beyond all others by M. Dantier's record of their work and their influence. In our days the world is working out its own philosophy to the bitter end, and casting aside as antiquated the grand old Christian ideal of every element of human life. When we hear the Church and the world make use of the same term, we are now accustomed to expect that the same word in the mouth of each means two very different things. For instance, progress, liberty, or liberal views, truth, or honour, or even education, are terms that have been travestied to a different significance from what they bear for the children of the Church. Therefore, when our author speaks of woman's mission, we are aware that he uses the word in the Christian sense, and that he will not frighten our ears with what has become the noisy watchword of a certain section of the world in the nineteenth century. And the great difference between the two meanings is summed up in the thought that became impressed upon us by the internal evidence of these biographies of Christian womanhood. The heroine of the Church is before all things humble, and it is without choice or ambition, as the handmaid of the Lord, that she falls into her place in the scheme of Providence, or, in other words, fulfils her mission on earth. Utterly in contrast with her, far apart as pole from pole, the woman with a mission introduces herself to the world, pushed forward by the sense of her own importance, and sustained by the very force of self-confidence. There are, indeed, some amongst these biographies which tell the tale of brilliant lives; but the grandeur that has made their record live down to our time is not the grandeur of throne or court, but that of the ordinary duty-doing spirit tried by such trial, or else the violent contrast of extraordinary humiliation and suffering. Throughout these nineteen centuries there are countless women of every class and every clime whom the universal voice of the Church honours as having fulfilled upon earth a noble mission; but there is not one of them who does not in some degree share the honours of the Magnificat with the most exalted of women, only by sharing its supreme sign of predestined exaltation. The Christian mission of womanhood is a most humble and hidden mission; the bene-

diction of generations comes not in God's choice to ambition, nor even to masculine philanthropy, but to lowliness. They who fulfil woman's mission begin in quiet humility, and travel their grand path, not looking forward, but as servants of a higher Will going on from deed to deed. They are not philosophers, nor conscious benefactors of humanity; they are willing hand-maids, like her of Nazareth. We shall return again to this marked contrast, which alone reconciles us to using that much-abused word, "woman's mission." But first we shall follow M. Dantier's study with a rapid sketch.

With the history of the dawn of Christianity upon Rome, we find naturally Plautilla's legend linked with the name of the Apostle of the Gentiles; and it is easy to account for the ardour with which the women of that age, even in greater numbers than the men, accepted his message of the new faith, when we reflect that the adoration of the Virgin's Son meant the permanent exaltation of womanhood, the glory of virginity, the sanctification of maternity; and the apostolic teaching brought the sacramental character of marriage, and therein the safety of society. For the slave-woman as well as for her patrician mistress there came good tidings of great joy. M. Paul Allard, in his "*Esclaves Chrétiens*," has given an exact record of the first emancipation from slavery, the first granting of any rights to the living property of the Roman master. Christianity, he says, raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament, and opened to slaves access to every sacrament; it was the assertion of the honour of womanhood in the lowest grade as in the highest, and of the equal rights of every human soul; and the reduction of this theory to practice resulted in the anxiety of the vast hordes of Roman slaves to be subject to the sweet yoke of Christ. At the other end of the scale, the conversions of patrician women were even more remarkable; and the history of the early centuries is full of the names of women of noble birth and nobler soul who enriched the Church, succoured her pastors, or began the unending apostolate among the sick and poor. It was also their emancipation from that fatal emptiness of mind and frivolity of heart, which, as classic history and the comedy of social life tell us too plainly, left but little room for good in the secluded life of Greek and Roman women. The mistress of many slaves and of wide wealth learned the new lesson addressed to her heart; and the slave and the poorest of the poor became her brethren and her heirs, exalted as representatives of Christ. She was given at the same time the right and the duty of exercising her mind; she seized the chance with a hungry yearning for food of thought, and the result was that all-absorbing faith which made so many virgins and so many martyrs. Many there were of whom it

might be said, as our author says of Plantilla, the disciple of St. Paul, that her great distinction was her full consciousness of the value of an immortal soul, her realization of the eternal happiness promised to the just. "To her those dogmas were no philosophical abstractions, but living realities." Her sense of the infinite was of such powerful attraction that she did not care for aught else when once her soul had seen down into those immeasurable depths. So she passed out of life by an early death, as one released from bondage, without a glance of regret towards patrician splendour, or towards her kinsman, Vespasian, newly raised to the Imperial throne. She and a thousand more had accomplished by faith what a great saint of a later century had realized in vision; she had "seen eternity." There is a super-human grandeur in this strong grasping of the truth by the first Christians. Life sank to one level with the gates of eternity at its end; witness the change which Christianity brought into Roman social life when, for the first time, under the influx of noble women to the new faith, the Church bound in marriage the patrician's daughter and the freed-man whom the civil law disdained to unite. Death itself became desirable, and fearless suffering seemed a natural outcome of the magnificent fulness of faith; hence the countless histories of the martyrdom of valiant women, making glorious the annals of three centuries; and hence in these pages the tenderly-drawn picture of "The Martyrs of the Faith," wherein we not only watch the crowning scene of the virgin Cecilia's triumph, but see her in the ordinary life of her day at the marriage feast, and follow her, still earlier, in the long unconscious preparation for martyrdom—the life of faith that leads us down with her to explore the half-darkness of the catacombs, or into the midst of the crowd of mendicants. We have dwelt upon this early phase of the subject, because out of the Christian exaltation of womanhood, and out of the generosity with which the newly-acknowledged soul seized and avowed its privileges of faith, are evolved all the glory of women in succeeding ages and all their service to the world. The Gospel of Christ was at once their patent of nobility and their charter to labour, and whatever influence they have possessed for the ennobling of humanity, it has been due to the honour granted them by Christian truth, and to that response of strong faith and characteristic generosity which in the beginning was fruitful of martyrdom, as in these days it is fruitful of sacrifice. We must pass over the succeeding chapters—the rise of the monasteries, the African Church and the solitaries, gathered under the beautiful title of "The Martyrs of Penance;" the finding of the Cross by a pilgrim empress, and the first centuries in the Holy Land—and we come to the large share which was taken in the con-

version of the Western nations by the influence of Christian princesses, the wives of pagan kings. "The Anglo-Saxon Race and their Apostolate" brings before us the familiar names of Bertha, Etheldreda, the Abbess Hilda; but the next chapter traverses newer ground, under the suggestive title of "Poetry and the Drama in the Cloister." As M. Dantier observes, if there is a curious fact in the history of literature in the Middle Ages, it is assuredly the reappearance of the Latin drama in a German convent of Benedictine nuns in the tenth century. In the midst of a half-barbarous people and of a century reputed as the calamitous and unlettered Iron Age, we here come across proofs of liberal culture and familiarity with the classic languages, not only in religious houses of men but of women. The Abbess Hrothwitha, aspiring to produce Christian dramas in the style of Terence, and to teach their parts to her nuns, is a wonderful revelation of the freedom of cloistral education, and no less a disclosure of the simplicity of life and thought which made a humble nun unwittingly the reviver of the Latin drama. It is characteristic of Hrothwitha, as well as of her time, that in praying for poetic inspiration in one of her preludes she reminded the Holy Virgin that even Balaam's ass was made to speak wisely; and in the whole group of studious nuns, of which the Saxon convent was the home, we may be sure there was the same desire of utility and not of learned repute. This is the reason why, after reading of Hrothwitha's dramas in the cloister, we are not startled by contrast when we come upon the record of works of a far different character written in long succession in the same tongue by other abbesses—Hildegard, Hedwige, and the great St. Gertrude; and the name of St. Hedwige leads on to the charities of her niece, St. Elizabeth of Hungary, thus closing in the thirteenth century with woman's everlasting place as an almsgiver the chapter which opened with her fitful place in the progress of literature. In subsequent pages the life of the great Countess Matilda shows a feminine influence exerted in appeasing the long struggle between the German Emperor and the Holy See; and the same mission of a peacemaker finds still grander illustration in the chapter devoted to "The Virgin of Siena, Avignon, and Rome." In the short survey of the thirteenth century there are noted indications of the increasing influence of women in the world—religious, political, and social. That century saw the revival of fervour in Italy, and St. Clare, at the word of St. Francis, founding the austere order which, spreading through France and Germany, was to be as a leaven to the age. In the political world, it was the period of the two regencies of Blanche of Castile, as yet the most formal recognition of the power of a woman to hold regal rights, even against a feudal nobility, and to

rule a great nation wisely. As to the world of social life, it was the age of chivalry, when knight and troubadour vied with each other in causing the spirit of romance to change almost into a fanciful worship the homage paid throughout Christendom to womanhood. In remarking this threefold growth of influence in the thirteenth century, M. Dantier aptly points out that it was also the century when through all Christian countries there was a fresh development of devotion to the Madonna. Invoking her name, it was then that there sprang up the cathedrals of Gothic architecture,

the magnificent churches of which the slender columns, the boldly vaulted roofs, the aerial spires, seem to proclaim, high over all, the glory of the mother of the Redeemer. To exalt her and to glorify her in their turn, painters and sculptors were soon joining with the builders, and art under all its forms was consecrating to the Blessed Virgin marvellous works radiant with that heavenly and ideal beauty which could be drawn from no other source than Christian inspiration.

It was also the time when the question of the Immaculate Conception was being constantly discussed and earnestly defended by the new Franciscan Order; and there can be no doubt that the influence of women—whether peopling the cloister, ascending the throne, or from the humblest hearth inspiring what was best in chivalry—was an influence increasing in exact correspondence with the growth of devotion to the Immaculate Virgin. While through the earlier centuries the Church was developing the doctrine concerning her, and while the world, already believing, was slowly realizing her privileges, homage to the Madonna and the respect for womanhood increased side by side. And undoubtedly each Christian instinct reflected fresh light upon the other, for we must not forget that if there would have been no age of chivalry but for the worship of the Virgin Queen and Mother, neither would there have been so rapid a development of devotion but for the preparation of the mediæval world by its spirit of chivalry.

In the chapter devoted to the *Divina Commedia*, the influence of Beatrice Portinari is described under the title of "The Inspirer of a great Poet." But when we consider the actual circumstances of the meeting with Beatrice, and perceive in the poem, written many years after, the exaltation of her character as the type of theology, it becomes evident that it was to no individual charm and no mere poetic passion that the world owes Dante's masterpiece. It was created by the cherished growth in his own mind of the ideal of Christian womanhood, an ideal which was high and etherealized in proportion to his poetic gift and his theological science. Passing on to a far different subject, *Dieu et la Patrie* is the motto of the history of Jeanne d'Arc.

The womanly nature of this warrior-maiden is admirably shown in M. Dantier's relation of the well-known story. In referring to the modern theory, that her voices and visions were hallucinations, the effect of a vivid imagination upon a weak and unhealthy mind, he declares that the facts of the case give such a theory a positive denial :

A sound mind in a vigorous frame, a soul, religious but of a practical turn, not disposed to superstition, Jeanne was neither inclined to mysticism nor hallucination. Finely constituted, "very beautiful with great strength and power," as her contemporaries say, she had nothing virile about her appearance, for hers was a modest bearing and a low voice, the voice of a woman, as those attest who heard it.

This strangest episode in all history is not without others resembling it at a distance, but it is without a parallel. It shows us a woman achieving a work utterly outside woman's sphere, and with evidences of power almost superhuman ; and we admire the heroine of such exceptional work all the more in comparison as we regard her not as an Amazon, but as the simple prayerful peasant girl of Domrémy. The next advance in history leads us to the great religious renewal of fervour in the sixteenth century, when, simultaneously with the so-called Reformation, there came into the world a St. Teresa to renew the contemplative life, and a St. Ignatius to organize a new army for the active apostolate. "St. Teresa, the highest personification of Spanish mysticism," is the central figure in this study, and the author warmly advocates the reading of her autobiography and her works, as not only useful in the cloister, but most profitable to those who form a part of the intellectual world, and who profess to honour the mind rather than its material surroundings. "In those dreary hours when they are assailed by doubt and delusion, let them take up St. Teresa's 'Life,' and they will soon be strengthened and consoled when face to face with that ardent energetic faith, that supreme detachment from the things of earth." And here we would remark that since the humility of a Christian woman is the test of her mission and the proof that her labours will abide, there is no more marked example of it than we find in the spirit of the Saint of Avila. It is not only edifying in a devotional sense, but charming in a human sense, to read in the preface of one of the mystic works of her who was to be placed among the doctors of the Church, the humble avowal : "I am, indeed, like those birds which are taught to talk ; knowing nothing but what is taught to them, or what they hear, they repeat it continually. If our Lord wishes me to say something new, He will deign to inspire me ; if not, He will make me remember what I have written before, and to me that

will be no little favour." Or elsewhere: "I write against my will and almost in odd times, because it keeps me from my spinning, and I am in a very poor house where there is a great deal to do." The saint whose work was thus marked with the seal of future exaltation had in her time to accomplish in seclusion a great mission towards the outer world. Her position with regard to the Protestant Reformation is thus indicated, to show how even the life of a contemplative nun became an active force in the history of her time and of the Church:

In the sixteenth century, the Carmelite Order, which dated back its antique origin as far as the prophet Elias, came forward from its habitual contemplation to take part in the movements of the Catholic world, at that time profoundly agitated by the Protestant Reformation. St. Teresa—who saw with sorrow the invading march of heresy, and who, as she said, would have given her life a thousand times to save one of those erring souls—believed that the Church should combat and vanquish her opponents by the all-powerful force of love. It was under such a conviction that she exclaimed mournfully: "How much I suffer to see the unhappy loss of so many Lutherans, by baptism members of the Church! And if we cannot witness the pain of any one whom we love without being touched with the deepest compassion, what affliction ought we not to feel at the sight of a soul casting itself for ever into the most fearful of all sufferings." The heretics, then, were to be won back, saved by the might of sweetness and charity. There was the sole means by which she thought that the cause of imperilled faith could be served by Carmel, whose very character and sweetness of spirit accorded with that view. Was it not that Order which had favoured the spread of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, thereby contributing to raise still higher the moral power of woman in Christian society? Was it not Carmel which, making known the scapular, had tempered what was terrible in the doctrine of eternal punishment, and in so doing had brought down to the affrighted conscience new hope and consolation? Lastly, was it not Carmel that had pronounced over Satan that word which in itself describes the greatest torment of the fallen angel: "Unhappy being!—he does not love!"

Without at once imprinting upon her Order that spirit of orthodox mysticism which in herself was personal and spontaneous, St. Teresa at least found the Carmelite Order, by its customs and tendencies, prepared to receive and develop the germs of such a spirit. But before reforming others, is it not necessary to begin the reform at home, and with the strictness of primitive rule to establish in each community the contemplative spirit, which, by prayer and charity, ought to facilitate that work of regeneration which it is desirable to accomplish? It was this labour which the Nun of Avila pursued without ceasing for a space of twenty years, believing herself called thereto by a vocation received expressly from God.

Again, rapidly changing the scene, before the close of the

same century, the next chapter is devoted to the tragic story of Mary Stuart, related for the double purpose of vindicating her character and showing her relation with regard to the surrounding religious and political revolution. "The Captivity and Death of a Queen" furnishes the end of her history; and she is portrayed not only as the brilliant and sorely tried woman, but as in heart and will the staunch defender of her ancient faith. Similarly given in two chapters, the next biography is of a very different kind and of more directly useful teaching: "Jane de Chantal; her Youth and Widowhood;" "The Origin and Progress of the Order of the Visitation." As a picture of a life in the world as well as in the cloister, such sketches as this contain invaluable material for study in our days. But to the following chapters on Port Royal we are far from being able to give equal praise. Neither the interest attaching to a great religious house, nor the virtue of its inmates, nor the splendour of their learning, nobility of birth, or grandeur of mind, can warrant the spirit of sympathy which seems to drift through those pages, when mention is made of the enforced obedience of a sisterhood which bore the ill repute of being infected with Jansenism. We must take exception to the later nuns of Port Royal as Christian heroines. As it has been well said of them, "chaste as angels, but proud as Lucifer," they formed part of the weakness of Catholic France in an hour when she was endangered by a most insidious evil. The story of their resistance is no elevating episode of cloistral life; for we cannot confound pride with grandeur of soul, nor allow obstinacy to pass muster as fortitude; nor forget, amid the enumeration of men of genius and women of great character, how the brilliancy of both genius and feminine character was being used as a strong influence against the spirit of the Church. But while we regret the indirect sympathy manifested in the latter part of this history, there is much to praise in the beginning, which relates to the earlier reform of the convent by the child-abess who grew up within its walls.

The chapter dealing with the letters of Bossuet introduces many of the great names of the seventeenth century belonging to the Court and the cloister. Madame d'Albert de Lhuynes, of the Abbey of Jouarre, unconsciously preparing for death, and then dying before the tabernacle; the Duchesse de la Vallière, turning away disenchanted from the blaze of the Court and received as a penitent among the Carmelites; Madame de Miramion, the almoner of the king, the lady of the *salons*, the mother of the poor, mingling with the world, yet with her life in its grand entirety belonging to God: these are some of the scenes and characters which enter into the narrative as linked to the great name of Bossuet by his spiritual direction or his friendship.

In opening a fresh chapter, "Religious Liberty in the United States," the evil atmosphere of the eighteenth century in France drives the author to seek his heroine beyond the Atlantic. Before quitting France, he does not shrink from noting woman's share in the errors of the age:—

In considering history with its social evolutions (he writes), we see each century assume a character of its own, and become distinguished from the rest by its glory or its dishonour, its grandeur or its baseness. After the century of Louis XIV. here is that of Louis XV.; after Bossuet and Fénelon, Dubois and Tencin; after Corneille and Racine, Voltaire and Parny. A new spirit is breathed over France as over all the countries of Europe, threatening to overthrow society from summit to foundation. The old barriers go down; the old institutions are done away with; public morals are corrupted; and, notwithstanding useful reforms necessitated by the times, dissolution progressing more and more gives warning that the final catastrophe is inevitable. As if to make themselves deaf to the warnings of the future storm, the privileged classes pass in empty amusements the time which they feel day by day slipping away from them. They seek enjoyment, they sing and laugh among themselves at their supper parties, welcoming with great bursts of merriment Beaumarchais' sallies on the advantages of birth and the spirit of caste, or they pass round satirical couplets directed against the clergy, the nobility, the State. . . . Drawn in their turn with the current, the women forget at the same time the restraint natural to their sex and the example of those who went before them, and, burning what was once adored, they adore what was once condemned. Instead of the polished and decorous assemblies held formerly in the *salons* of Mmes. de Rambouillet, De Sevigné, and De la Fayette, there were now the literary and philosophical coteries presided over by Mmes. du Deffant and De Graffigny, Geoffrin and D'Épinay. Having a certain amount of celebrity, and choosing for the directors of their conscience a Diderot or a D'Holbach, a Helvétius or a D'Alembert, these women made their houses the convents of the sect of Encyclopædists. The *salon* was their chapel, or rather the temple of the new worship; the supper was the *agape* destined for the celebration of mysteries more or less licentious. What a change! It was by means of women becoming its apostles that the philosophy of the eighteenth century was propagated and the number of its disciples increased. Shaking off the yoke of the Gospel, to so many others a light yoke, they took instead another which seemed for a while less heavy. Without in the least giving up the taste for fashion, or the use of powder and rouge and patches, the fervent adepts of the *Encyclopédie* pushed boldly out on the bottomless ocean of philosophic problems, drank eagerly the pleasure of forbidden treatises, and, devouring secretly worthless romances and political pamphlets, finished by getting up among themselves in their intimate reunions a case against God, the sacred ministry, and the divine government of the world.

Adding that the habit of profane raillery began with women even during their early education, the author cites the example of Marie de Vichy-Chamrond, a girl of noble birth, who, after disturbing a whole convent by her doubts and sarcasms, was handed over to be lectured by Massillon. After the tête-à-tête, when the abbess asked him what books would he recommend for the precocious sceptic, Massillon answered simply, with a world of wisdom, "Un catéchisme de cinq sous." Who can doubt that the ruin of many souls would have been prevented, many restless intellects steadied, many broken homes preserved, and that the evils of the eighteenth century would have been felt less in the family, if not less in the State, had those ladies of the Encyclopædic salons devoted their genius to the profundity of "the twopence-halfpenny catechism" while Voltaire was busy with his philosophers in the quicksands and shallows?

"Let us leave France (says M. Dantier), let us leave the deplorable history of that period of revolution, to seek abroad in Italy and then in the New World another subject of study, a subject full of interest and grandeur." The central character of this new history is Elizabeth Seton, an American lady of Scottish descent. Widowed in Italy, and owing her conversion to a remarkable train of circumstances, she became, on returning to the United States, the foundress of the Sisters of Charity in the New World. Her first impulse towards the Catholic Church is thus described, partly in her own words. In the first days of her widowhood, she was present, seemingly by chance, while Mass was said in the little church of Monte-Nero on the Tuscan coast, when there came the critical moment in the life of a great soul.

At the moment when the officiating priest was elevating the Host, a young Englishman, who was among the people present, approached her, and said in a low tone of mockery: "There—that's what they call their Real Presence!" By some inexplicable mystery of the human soul, the word of her own co-religionist produced upon Elizabeth an effect quite opposite to what would be anticipated. There was within her a sudden revulsion of feeling. "My soul," she tells us later on, "shuddered at that cold word spoken at the moment while they were adoring. Everywhere was silence and adoration; almost every one was bowed down. I recoiled in horror with an involuntary movement, and I went and knelt down upon the pavement before the altar, with tears, thinking within myself of the words of the Apostle upon the body and blood of the Saviour?" With that thought, and with other memories that came with it, she was suddenly struck by the doubts which had already occurred to her with regard to religious belief. A light broke in upon her mind, illumining it like the dawn of her new faith.

Returning to America, her conversion was completed, but only

at the cost of much poverty, abandonment, and suffering. "I do not look forward nor backward—I look upward!" were the words with which this noble woman fought her way through crushing trials, and became a faithful labourer for the Church and the benefactress of her country by spreading the institute of the Sisters of Charity upon the soil of the New World. The two illustrations—the simple farmhouse orphanage among the fields of Emmettsburgh and the subsequent erection, the magnificent ranges of building forming the Emmettsburgh Academy of St. Joseph—are in themselves a sufficient commentary upon the success of this brave woman's plan of looking upward. In the words of the author of the sketch, she was one of the patient and great-hearted of whom it can be said that she passed through life doing good. "Happy the souls who merit such praise! They have already received a recompense in the joy of their own self-devotion to all who suffer in this world. Happy those who, by having known life's woes, have been better able to console others, and who have learned from sorrow the secret of comforting the sorrowful."

"Faith and Charity in the Nineteenth Century" is the title of the closing chapter. In adopting that title for the epilogue it is explained that the special meaning has been to assert that even in this age of anti-Christian teaching and selfish systems there are still to be found in a multitude of souls "those two noble virtues which are the glory of humanity, and which seem in a special manner to belong to womanhood." In tracing the revulsion of feeling which followed the excesses of the first French Revolution, M. Dantier proves how largely the will of the women of France was consulted in these measures of peace which restored the free exercise of religion. They had, indeed, to contend in social life with opposition even from their own sex, for many had been brought up in indifference or under the influence of the Revolution, and it might almost be said that, with churches long closed, the way thither was forgotten. Many women of the *bourgeoisie* were still carried away by the persuasive influence of stronger minds preaching in the household the new gospel of unbelief from multiplied reprints of Voltaire and Rousseau. The good taste and Christian feeling of the opposite section of women did much to live down and cast into disrepute the literature that had inundated France. And while men strove to put the practice of religion out of fashion, wives and mothers heard in the churches the teaching of those great orators who came forward to reconcile the opinions and science of the age with the truths of religion, and that teaching they brought back into the bosom of the family, translating it, at least to their children, with the eloquence of the heart. One of

the most remarkable events of that time—an event of world-wide and everlasting influence—was the founding of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. And this immense work—so glorious to the Church, and so valuable, even in the material civilization of the world—was not in its commencement due either to the learned, or the rich, or to any high influence or powerful organization. The first members of the Propagation of the Faith were some workwomen in the city of Lyons. That city, which is at this day a focus of revolution, had the honour of beginning, in the year 1822, a work which has sent the peace and light of the Cross to the ends of the earth—to the New World, to the scattered ocean islands, to the tribes of the dark African Continent, to the all but impenetrable mass of human life in Eastern Asia. All praise to the workwomen of Lyons, who, little dreaming of their magnificent mission, said their chaplets together and collected their *sous* as the first members of such an apostolate!

If we turn to the nineteenth-century labours of religious orders of women, the subject at once widens to such immensity that we can only sum up its extent by saying that there is no form of human suffering, no misery of soul or body, which has not long ago been placed by the wisdom of the Church under the care of women consecrated to God and self-devoted to a life-long sacrifice for the sake of suffering humanity. Their province embraces every age of life, every grade of society, even down to the deserted and dying child, who has but time to pass through their hands to Heaven. They prepare the working classes for the noble life of honourable labour, and teach the children of the highest classes to fill in a befitting manner their place in the world. Their mission in many divided branches ends in embracing every need of the soul; as educators, their world is especially the world of innocence; but the world of penitence, and even of sin, is their world too; they open a last sanctuary to the sinner, and in their ministration in houses of refuge, in prisons and in the crime-infested byways of great cities, those unnamed women of the Church accomplish more for human society than the philanthropists and the men of statistics have dreamt of in their philosophy. Woman's work in alleviating bodily suffering has been used in such a systematic manner under the guidance of the Church, that the outer world is yielding her system the homage of imitation. The very name of Sister, given in these times to the hired nurse in a London hospital, is an acknowledgment of what Catholic instinct knew centuries ago—that there is a suffering heart within the suffering frame, and human tenderness is the only salve that can reach it. The perfection of that tenderness is naturally—or should we say supernaturally?—to be found only in her who, as the Spouse of Christ, sees Him

by faith, receiving the succour which is given for His sake. No other spirit will accomplish the same results; we are witnessing in these days the failure of human means and merely worldly training in the unhappy change which has taken place in French hospitals. As to the efficiency of Catholic religious orders for the care of the sick, it is too well established to be questioned. The most telling proof is the simple fact that the most famous of modern nurses of the sick, the lady who has developed hospital-nursing as a science in itself, passed years ago what one might call her apprenticeship with the Sisters of Charity in Paris, and learned from them the knowledge which the benevolent world has welcomed as a new science. The care of incurables and of the insane forms another most merciful and admirable part of the work of our religious orders; and it is an evidence of the exquisite refinement of charity which dwells in the spirit of the Church that the helplessness and loneliness of age is provided for as well as the weakness of infancy.* But this phase of our subject would lead us far past our limits by its own fascination. It is enough to add that if the contemplative life of religious orders of women is a mystery too beautiful for the world to understand, the active life is likewise a mystery which could not have been invented and which cannot be imitated outside the Church. It is one of the grandest outgrowths of Christianity—one of the marvels of civilization.

To return to M. Dantier's final chapter, the work of women in the nineteenth century by sympathy and by intelligence is illustrated with charming sketches of two contrasting characters, Mme. Swetchine and Eugénie de Guérin. The conversion, the charities, and the intellectual life of Mme. Swetchine, form a rapid sketch, brightened by such characteristic touches as that contained in the following anecdote of her meeting with another brilliant but less attractive, because perhaps less quietly feminine, figure in the Parisian world.

Full of reserve, and accustomed to raise her voice but little—different from Mme. de Staël, who liked dissertation better than friendly talk—Mme. Swetchine remained almost silent during dinner, scarcely looking at the celebrated woman who sat facing her. Mme. de Staël, who, being accustomed to homage, was somewhat piqued at the unexpected silence, advanced towards her when dinner was over and said: "They tell me, Madame, that you wished

* In a recent visit to Nazareth House, Hammersmith—a home for the aged, for orphans, and for maimed and incurable children—we were struck by the exposition of the length and breadth of charity implied in one answer: "And these afflicted children—how long will they remain here?" "We shall take care of them always; they will be among our old people at last."

to make my acquaintance; is it a mistake?" Madame Swetchine answered with as much readiness as *finesse*: "Assuredly not, Madame, but the king always speaks first."

The *salon* of Mme. Swetchine is described as no school of a special party, no literary coterie, no assemblage of disciples in which she wished to shine as a teacher. The crowd of the brilliant and the intellectually gifted, who made it a centre of union, found in their hostess, as M. de Falloux says, not one aspiring to shine or to teach, but a soul of invariable sweetness and kindness making the mixed assembly but one in harmony. The gift of causing pleasurable union, as here described, is no faculty reserved for the few; it is to be found wherever there is in a household a happy blending of the womanly nature with the Christian character. Every one can call to mind such centres of holy and happy influence, and woman's sphere of work in Christian society would be spanned but narrowly if we left out of account this social influence, exerted unconsciously upon every element of life and upon a constant procession of other minds. The social gifts of Mme. Swetchine only differed from those of many others by being, though of the same kind, of far greater, and, indeed, of extraordinary power. As an instance, we may cite Père Lacordaire's avowal of the benefit of her friendship:

It was after the Roman episode and the fall of the journal *l'Avenir* that the ex-disciple of Lamennais saw her for the first time. He himself has told how, after that great shipwreck from which his faith had escaped, he came to shore like a waif broken by the billows. At a distance of twenty-five years after, he loved to recall what she had done to put strength and light into his heart, when as a young man he was all but unknown to her. Her counsels, as he tells us, sustained him at the same time against doubt, weakness, and exaltation, so wonderful was her way of signifying by one simple word—"Take care"—whither he tended and where strength was necessary. "That charm given from above," adds Père Lacordaire, "was not felt by me alone. Other minds—my elders, or my comrades—felt its force, and it is impossible to say to how many souls that one soul was a guiding light."

The sketch of Eugénie de Guérin is an equally beautiful though widely different study; for the scene of that life was not the great world, it was the seclusion of a very simple life glorified by religion and sisterly affection, until a life-work with common hopes and common surroundings made, as the poet says:—

Life, death, and the great forever—
One grand sweet song.

In the final notices of Sœur Rosalie and Mme. Barat, we need only remark that, while the influence of the latter will probably be immortal among generations of women in the world,

the vast influence of Sœur Rosalie, though that of a religious also, must not be parted from the outer world. In some degree it even sprang from the world outside convent walls, for we read of the great Sister of Charity having her vocation determined by being led by her mother to visit the hospital of Gex.

Closing M. Dantier's volumes, we turn to cast a glance at woman's place and work in that uncloistered and too often unhallowed world, where, after all, the sphere of her destiny chiefly lies—that world which is full at all hours of secret womanly ministration, since it has been called "the great hospital of minds and of hearts." As we cast a backward glance over the work of women collectively and the special work of individuals in all those centuries, what we noticed at the outset is conspicuous at the close; the heroines of the Church, who have become the heroines of the ages, received their mission not as asserting a right, but as humbly following the track whither the Divine Will led them step by step. They shone even in the world's sight, or they achieved lasting labours, or they left an honoured name—not in comparison to their natural gifts or their individual exertions, for we know that millions of the brilliant and the powerful are unremembered while these names are immortal. It was a success in comparison as it was supernatural; the story of their lives, the picture of their character, impresses us in proportion as, aspiring to be "of Christ," they achieved in different degree the perfection of the feminine character—the Christian ideal of womanhood. The character developed by that ideal is the same in the crowned queen and in the poor work-woman, the same in the intellectual and in the simple, in the cultured and in the ignorant; it is the same, also, in the early centuries and in the nineteenth. It is the spirit of Christianity—identical in all classes, in all places, and in all ages—which creates this perfect harmony of the long succession of souls, this constant tendency towards the realization, more or less perfect, of one undescribed ideal. "*Belle âme*," exclaimed Montaigne, "*riche de vertus et marquée de l'antique marque!*" And we may take these words as applied to every soul, of whatever century, which has striven to reproduce in itself the type instinctively recognized as Christian and womanly—in other words, the woman of faith. There is a beautiful passage on this subject, which we cannot forbear from quoting, from one of the works of the late Kenelm Digby:

By merely beholding one woman's faith (he wrote) you might have been taught how to read the ancient Christian annals, which record the results of that of whole generations. . . . In her you behold at least a certain adumbration of the character of those holy women and generous patricians, the Marcellas, Paulas, Fabiolas,

described in the immortal pages of St. Jerome. When you had known her, you knew what was the exact character of many that you had read about in ages long ago. You knew what were their motives, their principles, their intimate thoughts, their wishes—I was going to add their very gestures and looks; for, as can be witnessed in a picture by Dominico Ghirlandaio, where he represents the death of St. Francis, each position and circumstance in life connected in any way with Catholic faith and customs, elicited in the thirteenth century, as no doubt from the beginning, the same traits and expressions of countenance that it produces at the present day.

And then in quaint style summing up even the literary interest of this character, antique yet ever new, he exclaims, regarding the type produced by a perfect faith :

But how can one describe the beautiful varied imagery, the antique, exquisite miniatures presented here? In her you found what is written by M. Monteil in his "History of Ancient Manners," all that he collected in parchment scrolls and in the dust of forty-thousand houses with towers and battlements you saw, not in separate fragments, but living and united in her. . . . It is like a saint of the Middle Ages that appears to us, a saint of the thirteenth century, or even of the primitive Church, and of the holy women that entombed Our Lord.

These ardent words suggest to us the character, moulded in faith, which is the identical character more or less attained by Christian woman in all ages. But in this age of ours, when, after the eighteenth century of impiety, luxury, revolt, we are surrounded by minds and manners becoming daily still farther removed from simple faith, it is only natural that the type should be too rare in the brilliant world and in the noisy world of clashing philosophies; and that another type, the product of this age, should be threatening us instead. We are told that the general movement of society in our days is from subordination to equality. The Church began by asserting the equality of the souls of men, the rights of the slave, and (by voluntary examples) equality through humility. The world has in time broken from under the light yoke of the Church; it asserts the equality not of humility, but of ambition, and the theory turned to practice is that democratic upheaval which, known as the Revolution, threatens to subvert the old order of the State and of society. In a similar manner the Church, in the beginning, vindicated the equality of woman's soul; raised her to the place of honour; secured her position by the apostolic teaching that marriage was not a capricious contract, but holy and indissoluble. In time, modern thought, by so-called progress, makes a return of ingratitude, threatening to overpass all the old social landmarks. There is arising an unchristian spirit of comparing the honourable

dependence natural to woman to the slavery of the first centuries and the serfdom of the Middle Ages, and demanding that as the slave and the serf have been emancipated in the course of civilization, woman also should be "emancipated"—that is, in political life, freed from enjoying the privileges which human nature at its best never fails to accord to the weakness arising, not from incapacity, but from the refinement of gentleness; freed from the mutual dependence of the sexes which belongs to Nature itself no less than to the spirit of the Church; and "emancipated" also—at least in the extreme form of modern theories—from the Christian teaching by which marriage has held human society together. There is no need to state that, as regards the repulsiveness of this last extreme view, there can be no question in a Catholic mind. The less extreme parts of the question—political rights, marriage rights with reference to the care of children or the safety of property, industrial rights, advancement of education—are open to discussion; but we have only space to touch upon them with a few words here. First, political rights: The arguments for and against this question would fill many volumes, but we are not stating arguments but noting evidences of the Catholic sentiment on these points. Two such indications occur to us on the surface of the discussion. In the first place the Catholic element is conspicuously absent in this agitation; and, as we contend that our women of every class are by no means deficient in interest in the world's affairs nor of less intelligence and perception than their Protestant (and Agnostic!) neighbours, we must take this absence as the evidence of their unspoken decision. In the second place we have endeavoured to realize one of the heroines who have passed before us in this review of the nineteen centuries adapting herself to those advanced modern ideas. However we dived for a chance among the varied names and times—Plautilla or Mme. Barat, Mme. de Miramion or Elizabeth Seton, Blanche of Castile or Mme. Swetchine—we could not get our heroine into harmony with a voting paper or a polling booth, a barrister's brief or a lecturer's platform, much less an election committee and a yearning to represent a free and independent borough. This being the case, we asked ourselves if the want of the political rights of women, at least in some forms of the modern demand, ever would have troubled the peace, or entered at all into the notions of the "*belle âme marquée de l'antique marque*." And we trust our answer will not tax the reader's ingenuity, but may be left to be divined by his own instinct.

The purely legal question of marriage rights regarding the guardianship of children and the holding of property is one that involves immense interests—no other than those of immortal

souls. One cannot help desiring that some means could be devised for legally giving the mother a more enduring right to the guardianship of her children; for in most mixed marriages the mother is the Catholic parent, and the pre-nuptial promise is no bond by law. But until the present law undergoes some alteration we must look to Catholic women before marriage, and not to legislators afterwards, for the righting of the wrong. Mixed marriages under the present state of the law are fraught with great peril to souls; and recent painful cases have given such ample evidence of this, that those examples alone ought to be sufficient to deter others from risking similar unhappy results. This is a question which rests largely with women. Theirs is the power to arrest by individual self-sacrifice an evil which as yet is rife under the law. Let it not be forgotten that a woman's greatest glory is the firmness of her self-sacrifice; and also that this question is one upon which it is a duty for women to be honestly outspoken as regards their view of the general principle involved. We can well understand how many true-souled women protest by a paradox that their greatest wrong is having their political rights agitated; but we cannot understand how any Catholic lady of the world can fail in sympathy for the unasserted marriage rights of the mother to her children, leaving her opinion unasserted merely through an indolent satisfaction in her own wiser choice or in her happier lot. If mixed marriages were not so common we should have less to say upon this point; but when a state of things, however evil, is in actual existence, we must take the case as it stands, and not on a supposition of how it ought to be.

The industrial rights of women are said to include admissibility to all offices, occupations, and professions, also admission to the universities; or some adequate provision for the education of women so as to fit them for high posts. We cannot go so far as this statement would imply; but regarding it as an industrial question on which may depend the self-support and honest livelihood of thousands, we should be glad to see what are called industrial rights extended so far as to prepare women by education and to admit them without hindrance to every position in the higher arts and in trade which a woman can fill without losing the refinement of the feminine character. This last word, of course, involves the hottest part of the question. We believe that, at least for Catholics, Christian instinct and good sense will be always an unerring guide. The profession of a lady-barrister is not, for instance, a lucrative post which would console the historic *belle âme* for the loss of its instinct of reserve. But the question in the lower paths of life is one of individual need rather than of general rule. The Lancashire cotton-worker, who stands beside her loom

until she wears into age in the midst of youth, is certainly driven by her need to a lot too hard for woman; but it is not unwomanly, and therefore it is honourable. On the other hand there are many who would declare a legal or political lady had chosen an occupation more lofty and less injurious to life itself; but, until feminine nature changes, we cannot call the higher leisure as honourable as the lower hardship; because it obviously implies less truth to the Divine design and to the Christian ideal of the different instincts of manhood and womanhood. In a word, no womanly occupation ought to be barred from self-dependent women; but Catholic tradition and teaching and individual experience are the only guides in distinguishing natural and just instinct from the effect of custom or of prejudice.

In many cases the fitness to take part in industry depends upon previous education; and this opens up the last question upon which we will touch—that of education. We do not refer here to that preparation of the mind and hands for necessary work, which is a kind of education that is a great need of the industrial classes; we refer to the culture of the intellect with no fixed object but such culture in itself. It has been well said, and by no less an authority than Mgr. Dupanloup, that the great difference between the education proper for women and for men is that a man's education has his intellectual development for its object, but in a woman such development is only an accessory of her life. It is a parallel case, then, to that of active work; where the feminine mind assumes the *rôle* of a masculine intellect it begins to reverse the natural order; and there can be little doubt that, except in some rare instances, the development of a woman's intelligence with no other object than intellectual development must result in the desuetude of other feminine attributes. To leave out of account altogether the question of capability, or of natural constitution and physique, we should fear for the day when the two minds, coming so differently formed and so beautiful in diversity from the hand of their Creator, were pressed into a like mould of training by the hand of man. By all means let our women learn all that can be required to fit them for honourable self-dependence at need, and to teach them to enjoy culture of mind beyond and above any immediate use: but let us keep as separate as they were kept by our Catholic forefathers the ideas of tender girlhood and of senior wranglers, of maidenhood and of fellowships.

Apart from its industrial use, there are a thousand uses for what may be called in the true sense of the word higher female education. Mgr. Dupanloup has stigmatized the prejudice against it as one of the worst products of the impious eighteenth century. He emphatically urged that the intellectual culture of

women was not only a right, but a duty. That was the reason why it was inalienable; and, as he added with one of his eloquent touches, if it was only a question of rights women could sacrifice them; but it was a duty; and sacrifice was not possible where it would lead to ruin. When he wrote his "*Femmes Savantes et Femmes Studieuses*" he defined his meaning, and cleared away a good deal of un-Catholic prejudice in France, by opposing to the modern evils of incapacity, frivolity, mismanagement, and *ennui*, the plan of the scope and advantages of a woman's continued self-education, the place which it might fill even in the busy life of wife and mother, and the service that would thereby be rendered to the household, to her children, to society, and to the Church. He distinguished the studious woman of sense, capable of some thought and seriousness, from the pedantic woman whom Molière satirized in his "*Femmes Savantes*;" and, as he indicated, Molière himself no more attacked reading and instruction in that comedy than he attacked religion itself in "*Tartuffe*;" his subjects of satire were pedantry in the one and hypocrisy in the other. To the bishop's mind the advantages of some intellectual culture continued in after-life were the more intelligent management of the household, the more fitting companionship of the husband, the more worthy education of the children. He added to these the increased attractions of the home as a centre of family life and recreation, the decrease of the spirit of frivolity, the good effect of the well informed mind of a Catholic hostess upon her guests and her social circle—an influence which we have seen admirably illustrated in the reference to Mme. Swetchine. Among their own families, he wrote, if women were not to be the first apostles of home no other apostle could enter there; "but it will be necessary for them to make themselves able, and truly able, for this apostolate:"—and then, quoting from M. Caro: "It is time that all minds professing the use of thought should awake to action: that every being gifted with reason should know how to protect it against the evil-doers working through literature, and how to repulse the attacks against God, the soul, virtue, purity, faith." We should accept, then, the opinion of the Bishop of Orleans on the high value of an intelligent self-culture in Catholic women; but naturally it should follow by degrees a wisely chosen plan, for a woman's education cannot aspire to follow the lines of masculine study. If it be education in the full sense of the word, and not merely the reading of books, it may be the same in degree for a well-informed woman as for a man, but in kind it must be widely different. Her education is not to be derived from books alone; it hardly seemed to be intended by Providence that her mind should be a storehouse of abstract knowledge; it has been well suggested that, to serve instead, God gave

woman's mind a greater readiness of transient assimilation, an almost intuitive perception, a tendency to the ideal and the beautiful. We doubt if the strong-minded section of our advanced thinkers can improve upon that divine fitness of harmonious design.

But woman's part in Christian society is not a mission of mind alone, it is supremely a mission of the heart; and whether her culture be little or great, or whatever her natural gifts, it is with the heart she will worship God and nobly serve his providence towards humanity. Such is preëminently the work of Christian mothers; and we can never review the service of women to the Church and to society without placing in the front ranks those innumerable heroines of faith whose influence is a power for good, through broadening generations. Mgr. Mermillod, in the address which he fearlessly called "The Mission of Women," defined it in two words—humility, sacrifice. "We must have souls of sacrifice," he exclaimed, "there is no medium between sacrifice and selfishness;" and again reiterating the word, "Remember, great things can be done by immolation and sacrifice." God makes great use of the power of woman, he declared; there is nothing lovely, nothing sublime without her, nothing bad without her. It is her destiny to pass through this world "as a sign of regeneration or of ruin; at the last day she will lead by the hand some one whom she shall have lost or saved, and with that soul she will inevitably be drawn." And when he looked round for the type of the mission of Christian womanhood, he saw no other, and no less, than that figure which was to the last, on Calvary, not prostrate, not falling, but "standing erect in the attitude of sacrifice." It is an unsurpassable type, the type predestined by the Creator, the perfect realization of the ideal which unconsciously-forms in one immutable spirit the womanhood of the Christian nations of all time.

Among the art-treasures which are stored, even to superabundance, in the volumes before us, it is this same type in a Madonna of Perugino that leaves the most abiding impression upon the mind. In the masterpiece at the Louvre the central figure is seated, surrounded, as it were, by a celestial court of two angels and two virgins. These turn to the Child, so infantile yet so divine; but the Mother—all youth and gentleness as heavenly as early Italian art alone could paint her—turns not to Him upon her knee, but bends on the spectator a patient wistful gaze, as if by looks, not words, inviting all to draw near fearlessly to his winning helplessness. It is a conception more of Heaven than of earth, and it holds unbounded suggestion for meditative eyes. The mediæval dresses and ornaments, the faint far background of Italian landscape, show how accustomed to the things of

Heaven were those minds of the early painters, when they could thus naturally bring down the Madonna and the saints into the midst of their own time and their own familiar land. It reminds us of the same Christian spirit in later days, even up to our own, tracing, in the living colours of a passing life, in the midst of commonplace scenes and times and things, shadowy images of the heavenly ideal, the perfect Woman. And if, by simple winning looks, she pleads from Perugino's picture, luring the indifferent world to her heavenly court, who can doubt that many a far-off, unconscious copy of the same pure ideal, not speaking a word, perhaps not thinking a thought of such a work, is a silent living influence winning the unthinking world a little nearer and nearer yet to appreciate the beauty of holiness and to worship Christ. But it was not with the Divine Infant in her arms, not as a blissful mother, that Mary's life-work was achieved. It was in the act of sacrifice and in the hour of humiliation that she became the Mother of the Redeemed. The same design seems to mark and sanctify the earthly destiny of even her lowliest daughters. There may be beautiful lives without sorrow; but they are not the most powerful lives. It is only a new form of an old truth when we say that every Christian life becomes Christ-like, noble in itself, and powerful for others, in proportion as it becomes a life of self-sacrifice, suffering, humiliation. And what is true of individual souls is not less true of Christian womanhood as a whole. It grows grand in itself and beneficial to mankind in proportion to the degree in which it accepts the mission of its type beneath the Cross—not resting, not sinking, not failing in endurance, but passive under the Divine Will, "standing erect in the attitude of sacrifice."

ART. IV.—THE DAYS OF THE WEEK, AND THE WORKS OF CREATION.

CHRISTIAN Apologists who, during the last half-century, have devoted their labours to the task of vindicating revelation from the charge of being opposed to reason, have, when endeavouring to harmonize the first chapter of Genesis with scientific facts, placed much reliance on what is commonly known as the "Period" theory.* The general outline of this theory,

* It is not the only theory that has been advanced for the purpose. *The Month*, in an article which appears in its number of last January, entitled "What were the Days of Genesis," enumerates four, and gives a clear explanation of each—the "Allegorical," the "Literal," the "Inter-

(authors differ on matters of detail) consists in assuming that the days spoken of in Genesis are to be reckoned, not as days of twenty-four hours, but as long periods of time, during which the organization of the world was gradually carried out in accordance with the physical laws given to matter by the Creator, and the earth was prepared for the reception of plants and animals which were created by the immediate action of God. The statement of Genesis that the sun, moon, and stars were not made till the fourth day—notwithstanding that day and night, morning and evening, are spoken of as existing from the very first day, and that plants are described as growing and bringing forth seed on the third day—is a serious difficulty in this as in other theories. To meet it, it is usual to suggest that our globe, when first it assumed a consistent form, was in a state of incandescence, from which it only gradually cooled down, and that, long after its surface had been divided into land and water, and vegetation had sprung up—that is to say, up to the date represented by the fourth day or period—the temperature of the waters was such as to give rise to a mist which enveloped the whole earth and excluded the direct rays of the sun. Thus, the statement that the sun, moon, and stars were made on the fourth day or period is explained to mean that not till then did their direct rays reach the earth, though they had been in existence ever since heaven and earth were created.

The obstacles which stand in the way of adapting the words of Genesis to the various details of the "Period" theory are neither few nor easy to be disposed of, as everybody is aware who has read any of the books or papers published on this subject; but, even if it be granted that these obstacles may be satisfactorily overcome, the question still remains how far the theory itself can be said to be in harmony with the facts of modern science. A serious objection to the soundness of the theory arises from the fact that its difficulties do not diminish, but on the contrary increase, in proportion as the science of geology advances and new facts come to light. The discovery of a zoophyte, *Eoon Canadense*, in the Laurentian strata, seems fatal to the theory of a very high temperature of the ocean, so far back, at least, as the earliest formations of which geology has any knowledge; for it shows that the waters in which the Laurentian strata were deposited were of a temperature capable of supporting animal life. Geology has made great strides since the day when the "Period" theory was first

val," and the "Period" theories. These are all equally tolerated by the Church; but as the "Period" theory is the one which at present seems to be gaining ground, it is the only one to which it will be necessary to devote some remarks at the commencement of the present Paper.

propounded, some sixty years ago. The very foundation on which that theory rested has been rudely shaken. If the days of Genesis, which are described as having evening and morning, are to be reckoned, not as ordinary days but as periods, they must at least be taken to represent periods with defined limits, having a beginning and end, as days have morning and evening. In fact, this is what they were understood to be by Cuvier, Pianciani, and other exponents of the theory. In the days when these authors wrote, the opinion was still common amongst geologists of note that the crust of our planet had been subject to a series of violent convulsions. The sudden break which was noticed to exist between the flora and fauna of formations closely following each other in geological succession (as, for instance, the Chalk and the Eocene), was held to indicate that the continuous action of Nature's laws had been suddenly checked by some violent catastrophe marking the close of one order of things and the commencement of a new one. It was on this doctrine that the "Period" theory was grounded; for it seemed not unreasonable to suppose that the days of Genesis, if understood as periods, might correspond with these geological breaks. Sir Charles Lyell became the vigorous opponent of the doctrine of violent changes, and his "Principles of Geology" are a masterly demonstration of the continuous action of physical causes. The breaks of continuity in the geological record are shown to be due partly to the limited extent of our explorations, partly to the enormous amount of denudation which has gradually taken place, and partly to the circumstance that large tracts of the earth's surface have remained dry land during the whole of the time occupied by the formation of successive geological strata; the consequence being that when those tracts of land have again been submerged the deposits laid upon them are found to belong to an entirely different order of things, the result, not of any sudden change, but of changes which have been going on during the whole of that long period during which the tracts spoken of were dry land. It is now almost universally admitted by scientific men that throughout the period of time required for the formation of the whole series of rocks known to geologists, from the Laurentian downwards, the action of the forces of Nature has been uniform; that there has been no sudden or violent break in the sequence of things; and that though the actual distribution of land and water, no less than of plants and animals, over the face of our globe at the present day is altogether different from what existed in former ages, the transformation has been brought about gradually, and with as little disturbance as that caused by changes which are going on at the present day. There is no reason therefore for dividing this space of time into four, six, or any number of distinct

periods; and thus the ground on which the "Period" theory rested ceases to exist.

This is not the occasion for entering upon a detailed inquiry as to the many points in which the "Period" theory appears to be at variance with the science of geology in its present state of development, but there is an objection to it of a different nature which must here be stated. If the agreement of the words of Genesis with the teaching of modern science is so complete as to constitute an actual statement of facts which only of late years have come to the knowledge of scientific men, the author of Genesis can only have acquired the knowledge of such facts by a revelation from Heaven. Now this supposition is entirely at variance with the whole analogy of revelation. Nowhere in Scripture do we find that Moses or any other of the sacred writers received revelations from Heaven regarding details of astronomy, geography, chemistry, or any other branch of natural science. On the contrary, whenever they touch upon similar topics we notice that these writers make use of the kind of language, and display the amount of knowledge, common amongst their contemporaries. What grounds are there for supposing an exception to have been made in the sole case of geology? Why attempt to make a geologist of Moses? So long as men persisted in using the words of Scripture as a groundwork on which to build up astronomical theories, war was carried on between the votaries of science and the adherents of revelation. The conflict ceased the moment it was recognized that sacred writers, when alluding to natural phenomena, spoke of them as they appear to the senses, which was the only way in which men of science were acquainted with them in the days when those writers flourished, and which is the way of speaking of them, even at the present day, on all occasions when scientific accuracy is not required. If we attempt to fasten on the words of Moses a meaning in conformity with the discoveries of modern times, the attempts to reconcile Scripture with geology are not likely to be more successful than were those former attempts to reconcile Scripture with astronomy. Will anybody venture to assert that the study of Genesis has ever led to the discovery of a single geological fact? A revelation which reveals nothing, what useful object can it be supposed to serve?

It is not intended by these remarks to insinuate that science and religion bear no relation to each other, or that no help can be derived from the former towards the right understanding of Holy Writ. On the contrary, the assistance which scientific researches may afford in this respect is very great. Neither is there any desire to undervalue the labours of those who have propounded theories how to reconcile the words of Scripture with

modern discoveries. There is much in the works of such authors which cannot fail to be instructive and useful to students of Holy Scripture; but it must be borne in mind that only in very recent times have men learnt to read "the language of the rocks;" and science has only lately been brought to bear on the records of pre-historic times. Even at the present day these branches of science may be said to be in their infancy. New facts are constantly being brought to light which oblige scientific men to modify conclusions previously arrived at. All attempts to establish harmony between terms of which we possess only an imperfect knowledge must necessarily be, to a certain extent, tentative; nor is it to be wondered at if theories which seem to agree pretty well with facts so long as these are only imperfectly understood, have to be abandoned as untenable when the true bearing of those facts has been more fully brought to light by later discoveries. This seems to have been the fate of the "Period" theory. If that theory has failed, it cannot be esteemed rash to seek to arrive by a different route at a satisfactory solution of the problem how to reconcile the words of the first chapter of Genesis with modern science. Such is the object aimed at in the present Paper.

Geology is not the only branch of science which has made great and rapid progress in the present day. The monuments of Egypt, Palestine, Assyria, and other Eastern countries, have afforded a rich field for the discoveries of eminent archæologists and scholars, and, thanks to their labours, the present generation is in possession of a stock of information regarding the manners, the customs, and the learning of the ancient inhabitants of those countries far exceeding that which was at the disposal of students of Scripture at any former period. Wilkinson's "Manners and Customs of the Egyptians," with the learned notes of Sir Samuel Birch; Sir A. Layard's "Nineveh;" "The Chaldean Account of Genesis," by Mr. George Smith—a new edition of which has lately been published by Professor Sayce—and other such works are of the greatest assistance towards arriving at a right understanding of the writings of Moses. Every writer is influenced by his surroundings; by the manners and customs of the people amongst whom he lives, and for whom he writes; by the work of contemporary writers, and by the state of literature and science in his day. Moses is no exception to this rule; and therefore accurate information on all these points must greatly assist us to understand the meaning and object of his writings. Not without reason has it been recorded of him that he "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts vii. 22).

Who was Moses? He was a Hebrew by nation; a descendant of Abraham and Thare, who had come "out of Ur of

the Chaldeans to go into the land of Chanaan" (Gen. xi. 31). The rank of Abraham warrants the belief that he and some of his followers were not ignorant of the learning and traditions of Chaldea, his native land. These, no doubt, were preserved amongst his posterity. By birth Moses was an Egyptian, his family having, during several generations, resided in Egypt. In his infancy he had been adopted by Pharaoh's daughter as her son, and had received an education becoming a member of the royal family. He was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians"—words which imply that he belonged to the class of the priests, who alone were initiated into the mysteries of Egyptian learning. There can be no reason to doubt that he studied at Heliopolis, the On of Scripture, a small but celebrated city of Lower Egypt.

It was at Heliopolis, or On, that Potipherah (Gen. xii. 45) was a priest whose daughter Asenath was given in marriage to Joseph. . . . The Priests of the Sun at Heliopolis, like those of Thebes and Memphis, were celebrated for their learning; and it was to this city that Plato, Herodotus, Eudoxius, and other Greek sages repaired in order to study the wisdom of the Egyptians; and Pythagoras, according to Plutarch (*de Isid.* s. 10), was the disciple of Oniuphis the Heliopolite. Astronomy and all branches of sciences were studied at Heliopolis; and the Priests of the Sun enjoyed the greatest reputation for learning. (Wilkinson, "Manners and Customs of the Egyptians," vol. iii. chap. xiii.)

Besides being one of the "initiated" amongst the Egyptians, Moses was a prophet and a lawgiver. As a prophet, he was entrusted by God with a special mission to reclaim the Jews from the idolatry into which many at least of them had fallen during their stay in Egypt, and to instruct them in the true religion of their forefathers. As a lawgiver, he was invested by God with authority to make laws and ordinances for the special purpose of guarding against a relapse into idolatry. The national superstition was so mixed up with the ordinary every-day actions of the Egyptians, that the mere fact of living amongst them had familiarized the Jews with idolatrous habits; and the customs of Egypt had thus become to them a special source of danger. Hence many of the ritual laws of Moses are framed with the express object of making the Jews forget the idolatrous customs of Egypt, by substituting in their place other rites and customs tending to remind the people of the one true God. Amongst other matters relating to daily life, the *Calendar* furnished the Egyptian priests with a ready means of keeping the memory of their false gods constantly before the minds of the people.

They claimed, says Herodotus (*Herod.* ii. 82), the merit of being the first who had consecrated each month and day to a particular

deity; a method of forming the calendar which has been imitated and preserved to the present day; the Egyptian gods having yielded their places to those of another pantheon, which have in turn been supplanted by the saints of a Christian era; and they also considered themselves the first to suggest the idea of foretelling from the natal hour* the future fortunes of each new-born infant.† (Wilkinson, vol. i. chap. xii.) Each month was under the protection of a deity.‡ (Wilkinson, *ibid.*) "Each day of the month was sacred to a deity, and had a festival by which it could be cited instead of its numerical order. Thus the first day was called the festival of the Neomenia; the 26th the festival of the manifestation of Kem or Amsi; the 30th the festival of the locust." (Brugsch, "Mat. du Cal.," pp. 53-55.)

"Dion Cassius also distinctly says that the seven days of the week were first referred to the seven planets by the Egyptians." (S. Birch, note to Wilkinson, *ibid.*)

"A week of seven days was also in use amongst the Chaldeans from the earliest ages. The days of the week were named after the sun, moon, and five planets" (Rev. A. H. Sayce, "Babylonian Literature,"

* The Papyrus Sallier IV. is a calendar or almanack of this nature. The particular gods and mythic events of each day are specified, as also the things to do and avoid, and the fate of persons born on particular days. Each day was divided into three portions, and the terms good or bad applied to it in accordance with its character. (Chabas, "Calendrier Sallier," p. 21, 8vo, Paris.) S. Birch, note to Wilkinson, vol. i. chap. xii.

† In Chaldea, as in Egypt, every day of the year was under the protection of some deity or saint . . . and a long list of portents from the births of children records every accident, likely or unlikely, with the most scrupulous care. (Rev. A. H. Sayce, "Babylonian Literature," pp. 55-58.)

‡ These vary in type according to the representations of the Memnonium in the reign of Rameses II., and at Edfu, but the names are the same.

1. Toth	Goddess Texi.
2. Paophi	Ptah.
3. Athyr	Hathor.
4. Choeak	Seḫet, or Kahak.
5. Tybi	Amsi, or Kem.
6. Mecheir	Rex-ur (Anubis).
7. Phamenoth	Asḫenet (Aphera).
8. Parmuthi	Rannu (Harvest).
9. Pachons	Chons.
10. Payni	Har-xont ḫrutf.
11. Epiphi	Apet.
12. Messori	Harmachis.

Epagomenae, or Intercalary days.

1. Birth of Osiris.
2. Birth of Horus.
3. Birth of Set.
4. Birth of Isis.
5. Birth of Nephthys.

(Brugsch, "Mat. du Cal.," pp. 53-55.) S. Birch, note to Wilkinson, vol. ii. chap. xi.

p. 55), a mode of designation which was adopted by other nations and has continued in use to this day.

These facts plainly show what a powerful institution the Egyptian Calendar was for keeping alive idolatry amongst the people. It was a special source of danger to the Jews, and as such called for the special attention of the Jewish legislator. Accordingly Moses, though he availed himself of the astronomical wisdom of the Egyptians in regulating the Jewish year, did not adopt the Egyptian names for the months; and the days of the month were ordered to be cited by their numerical order only. Though he established some festivals to be observed in the course of the year, he did not appoint a festival for each day of the month in opposition to the festivals by which the Jews had been accustomed to hear the days of the month cited in Egypt. Nor was it necessary for him to do so. Once out of Egypt the Jews were not likely to revert to the festivals of Egyptian deities. It was otherwise as regards the days of the week. These, as already noticed, were referred by the Egyptians to the seven planets, and this custom had been imitated by other nations. In Palestine the worship of the "host of heaven" prevailed even to a greater extent than in Egypt, and the frequent allusions made by the prophets to this form of idolatry, and the warnings addressed against it to the Jews, show how easily these were led astray by it.* It was not, therefore, sufficient that Moses should order the days of the week to be cited by their numerical order, and that he should abolish the use of such names as Day of the Sun, Day of the Moon, Day of Mars, &c., because, although the Jews themselves might abstain from using them, they would constantly have occasion to hear such appellations referred to by the nations in the midst of which they dwelt. It was necessary, further, to make each day tell of one God, Creator of all things, in the same way as the heathens had made the days minister to the belief that there were many gods and many lords. It was necessary to substitute an orthodox dedication in place of the idolatrous one which had been abolished. Now God is one, and therefore a dedication of each day of the week to him would be of no avail to distinguish one day from another. But though God is one his works are manifold, and these, if classified under separate heads, may afford subjects for separate dedications. Such, accordingly, was the method which Moses adopted. Having abolished all reference to the planets, he dedicated each day of the week to the memory of some work of creation performed by the true God, just as the Egyptians had dedicated each day of the month

* "Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as is written in the book of the prophets." (Acts vii. 42.)

to the memory of the supposed actions of false deities. It is this consecration of *the days of the week* to the memory of the creation, and not a history of *the days of creation*, that forms the subject of the first chapter of Genesis.

Here it is necessary at once to meet an objection. Do the words of Moses, it will be asked, really admit of such an interpretation? In Genesis we read: "God said, be light made, and light was made . . . and there was evening and morning the first day;" similar language is used regarding the other days. Of the seventh day it is said: "On the seventh day God ended his work which He had made." A parallel passage in Exodus is even more explicit: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh" (Exod. xx. ii.) Here we have distinct statements that certain works were done by God on specified days, which is something very different from saying that the days are commemorative of work done by God. If the "Period" theory is objected to (amongst other reasons) because it forces a constrained meaning on the words of Moses, is not the proposed interpretation open to a similar charge? In reply it must be acknowledged that when statements like those quoted are met with in a book of history, or are any way used in an historical connection, they must be understood to imply that, in the writer's opinion, the events actually took place at the time mentioned; but this rule does not apply to similar statements when they occur in liturgies, hymns, or other writings of a ritual nature. Great events, whether national or religious, are frequently commemorated on the anniversary of the days on which they occurred; but this is not always the case. At times it would be impossible to do so, for the simple reason that men are ignorant of the precise date at which the event took place. In such cases a day is arbitrarily fixed for the celebration. When, however, it has once been appointed, and inserted in the calendar, it is customary, in liturgical and ritual works, to refer to that day as the day on which the event took place, though in reality it is only the day on which it is commemorated. In the Catholic liturgy, for instance, on Easter day, expressions are repeatedly used such as "on this day Christ rose triumphant from the grave." These can only be regarded as true in the sense of this great event being on that day commemorated; because, owing to our method of computing Easter, and to the law that Easter must always be kept on a Sunday, it rarely happens that the festival is kept on the real anniversary day of the event. So, in the Egyptian calendar mentioned above, it will be noticed that the five intercalary days at the close of the year are described as the birthdays of the five greater divinities; yet in their mythology the

Egyptians did not teach that those personages were born on the five last days of the year. It was convenient to consecrate those days to the celebration of the births of those deities, and the days were accordingly said to be their birthdays. Numerous examples of a similar use of language might be cited from the liturgies and rituals of all religions in every age; it will be sufficient to quote one from the Roman Breviary which is clearly illustrative of the point in question.

The feast of the Epiphany is kept in honour of three manifestations of our Lord: His manifestations to the wise men of the East by means of a star; his manifestation on the day of his baptism, when a voice from Heaven proclaimed, "Thou art my beloved son, in thee I am well pleased;" and his manifestation at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, when he wrought his first miracle, "and he manifested his glory, and his disciples believed in him." Now it may well be doubted whether any one of these three events took place on the 6th of January, but it is absolutely certain that all three did not; for the marriage feast took place at Cana within two months of the baptism. Nevertheless one of the antiphons in the office of that day runs as follows.* "This day we keep a holiday in honour of three wonders: this day a star led the wise men to the manger; this day, at the marriage, water was made wine; this day was Christ, for our salvation, pleased to be baptized of John in Jordan. Alleluja!" ("Rom. Brev.," trans. by John, Marquess of Bute.) Here the assertion that these three events took place on the same day is every bit as positive as the statement in Exodus: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are in them, and rested on the seventh," or as the similar statements in Genesis. Taken historically, the assertion of the "Breviary" is untrue, but it is not supposed to be taken historically, nor has anybody a right so to take it. It occurs not in a book of history, but in a ritual book, and accordingly it is understood to mean no more than this, that the three events are commemorated on that day, and that that is the day set apart for their anniversary celebration. Unless therefore it can be shown that such expressions as "God made light on the first day," &c., form part of a book of history, or are somehow used in an historical connection, we have no right to attach to them an historical meaning. If they occur in a ritual work or in a ritual connection, they must, like the words in the Breviary, be understood to mean that the events are commemorated on the

* "Tribus miraculis ornatum diem sanctum colimus: hodie stella Magos duxit ad præsepium: hodie vinum ex aqua factum est ad nuptias: hodie in Jordane a Joanne Christus baptizari voluit, ut salvaret nos, alleluja. (In fest. Epiph., Ant. ad Magnificat.)

days mentioned; and, so far from doing violence to the words of Moses by so interpreting them, we are simply applying to them a rule of interpretation applicable to all ritual works. It follows from this that the answer to the question, What is the real meaning of the words used by Moses? is dependent on the solution of a previous question—viz., whether they occur in a book of history or in a ritual composition.

The ritual character of the passage in Exodus (xx. 11), is evidenced by the fact of its forming part of a ritual ordinance concerning the due observance of the Jewish sabbath. Moreover, it so clearly has reference to the first chapter of Genesis that its meaning must be dependent on the meaning of the said chapter. It is therefore with the character of the first chapter of Genesis that we are mainly concerned. This is commonly assumed to be historical because it forms part of the Book of Genesis, which is history. Commentators first assume that Moses is writing a history of the creation, and then endeavour to reconcile this supposed history with scientific facts. But what ground is there for such an assumption? That which we call the first chapter of the Book of Genesis (to which must be added the three first verses of the second), forms in reality no portion of that book. It is a composition complete in itself, and as totally distinct from all that follows as the Epistle to the Romans is distinct from the Epistle to the Corinthians, which is the next in order. It is not a history, but a *Sacred Hymn* recording the consecration of each day of the week to the memory of the work done by the Creator of heaven and earth. The seven days spoken of are not the first seven days counting from the commencement of time, but the seven days of the week—Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, &c.; for the Jews, not being allowed to call them after the names of the planets, had no other way of referring to them than by calling them First Day, Second Day, and so forth. The term "Seventh Day" in Scripture invariably means "Saturday." It matters not, so far as the present inquiry is concerned, whether the various writings of Moses were gathered into one codex or papyrus during the author's lifetime, or whether, as seems more probable, the collection in the form in which it has reached us is the work of a later age. The last chapter of Deuteronomy, which records the death of Moses, was certainly added by another hand at a later date. There is nothing, however, to prevent our supposing that Moses not only wrote this hymn, but that he himself assigned to it the position which it occupies at the head of his works. All that it is intended here to assert is, that the fact of this hymn appearing first in a collection of his writings is no evidence of its forming a portion of the historical work which follows it. The Book of Genesis really commences with the

words (chap. ii. 4): "These are the generations of the heaven and of the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth;" words which as clearly indicate the opening of a new work, as the words: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham," mark the commencement of the Gospel of St. Matthew.

The poetic character of this first portion of the Bible has been recognized by many. The learned Fr. Pianciani writes as follows:—

Others have remarked that the language of the first chapter of Genesis is figurative, and to a certain extent poetical. We do not assert that it is rhythmical; some people have said so. Be this as it may, the colouring and imagery savour of poetry. God speaks and makes his voice heard by inanimate beings, and these understand and obey it: God sees the light and his other works, and, like a craftsman pleased with what he has done, he approves of it. It would almost seem as if this were a canticle or traditional hymn inscribed by Moses at the head of his books. Poetry in its origin was eminently religious; and the hymn, the traditional song, proceeding by metaphor, is, according to Fred. Schlegel, the most ancient form of poetry. (Pianciani, "*Cosmogonia nat. comparata col Genesi*," Introd. p. 41).

Speaking of verse 27 of this same chapter, Keil says:—

In the account of the accomplishment of the divine purpose the words swell into a jubilant song, so that we meet here for the first time with a *parallelismus verborum*, the creation of man being celebrated in three parallel clauses.

God created man in his own image,
In the image of God created he him,
Male and female created he them.

("Biblical Comment. on Old Test."—Keil and Delitzsch, trans. by Rev. J. Martin. Vol. i. chap. i.)

Nor is there anything singular in the fact of Moses having written a hymn on the creation. One of the fragments discovered by Mr. Smith at Nineveh, and which he had supposed to contain an account of the Fall, has been shown by Dr. Oppert to be in reality a hymn to the creator Hea.

Not only the poetic character of this chapter, but several other circumstances, serve to mark the distinction between this hymn and the history which follows. Thus the "hymn" is "Elohistic"—*i.e.*, the Supreme Being is uniformly designated by the word *Elohim*, which the "Vulgate" translates *Deus*, God: whereas the portion of Genesis which follows is "Jehovistic"—*i.e.*, the word *Jehovah*, or *Jehovah-Elohim*, is always used; in the Vulgate, *Dominus*, or *Dominus Deus*, the Lord or the Lord God: a distinction which, though it need not be held to imply diversity of authorship, seems certainly to indicate that the break between the two portions of Scripture in which these distinct appellations occur

is greater than what might be expected in two chapters immediately following each other in the same book. Then there are some facts recorded, both in the "hymn" and in the subsequent chapter of Genesis (such as the creation of man, of plants, and of animals), and though there is nothing contradictory in the two statements, the two accounts are quite independent of each other. Take, for instance, the account given of the formation of Eve, in verses 21, 22 of chap. ii., and compare it with verse 27, chap. i. The statements are quite compatible, but the difference in the manner of describing the event (even apart from the poetic structure of verse 27) is such as we might expect to find, supposing the descriptions to form part of two different works written each with a different object. These observations show that the two portions of Scripture commonly known as the first and second chapters of Genesis are not in reality two chapters of one book, but are two distinct works, and that therefore the circumstance of the second being historical affords no proof that the first is also historical. Yet the assertions made in chap. i., viewed as history, are of so startling a nature as to exclude the supposition that the author intended them to be so understood unless clear proof be given that such was his intention. It is not only that these assertions appear to be at variance with the discoveries of *modern science* (St. Augustine speaks of the difficulty of meeting the objections raised against them by men of science in his day). But, what is of still greater importance to our argument, they conflict with that "wisdom of Egypt" in which Moses himself was learned. The Egyptians were well acquainted with the fact that vegetation is dependent for its development on the action of the sun. They were great astronomers, and regulated day and night, years and months, by the apparent motion of the sun, moon, and stars. Moses knew all this, yet if his statements about the creation of these objects are to be taken as history they are in open contradiction to the science of his day. This contradiction lasts so long as we persist in assuming that the first chapter of Genesis contains an historical narrative; it ceases the moment this assumption is dropped.

The views so far stated receive further confirmation from a comparison between this hymn of Moses and the various accounts of the creation* preserved in ancient records, and more especially the Chaldean account discovered by Mr. George Smith on the clay tablets and cylinders of Assyria and Babylonia.† Most of

* A collection of fragments of many of these ancient cosmogonies appears in the appendices to "*Les Origines de l'Histoire*," par François Lenormant. Paris. 1880.

† See "*The Chaldean Account of Genesis*," by George Smith. New edition by A. H. Sayce, Dep. Prof. of Compar. Philol. in the Univ. of Oxford. 1881.

the tablets discovered by Mr. Smith come from Nineveh and belong to the age of Asur-bani-pali, who was grandson of Sennacherib, mentioned in the Book of Kings, and who began to reign over Assyria in B.C. 670. The tablets are not originals, but copies from earlier texts, and those earlier texts were for the most part translations. Professor Sayce is of opinion that the texts we possess may be dated in their present form at about the year B.C. 2000. As regards the various versions of Genesis, he holds that they far exceed in antiquity the venerable histories of the Bible. There is nothing theologically unsound in this view, and as for its scientific value Professor Sayce is one of the chief masters of Assyrian studies. Moses may well have been acquainted with these texts, both as a descendant of Abraham who came out of Chaldea and as one instructed in the wisdom of the Egyptians. For the Egyptian priests, though boastful of their own superiority, were not unacquainted with the learning of other nations. This view, if correct, adds force to the remarks which follow. Much stress is often laid on the points of *similarity* which exist between the various ancient accounts of Genesis and the account given by Moses. The points in which they *differ* from each other are not less worthy of notice, and I shall call attention to three which are of great importance.

First: how comes it that, of all ancient writers, Moses is the only one who, speaking of the creation, introduces the mention of *days*? He mentions them not incidentally or casually: they form the characteristic feature of his discourse. Take away the mention of days from the first chapter of Genesis and its whole meaning vanishes. Now, if a tradition had been handed down from the earliest ages that the work of creation had extended over a definite number of days, how are we to account for the fact that not a trace of this tradition is to be found in any other of the various accounts of Genesis, but only in that of Moses, and that there it is given with such minuteness of detail? If it be suggested that Moses may have received on this point a special revelation from God, it is obvious to inquire why a revelation should have been given to man on a subject of this nature? more especially as up to the present day the meaning of the supposed revelation remains an open question, so that it is difficult to see what advantage man was to derive from it. The only satisfactory answer to this question seems to be that there never existed any ancient tradition concerning the number of days in which the world was created, and therefore no allusion to anything of the kind is to be found in any of the ancient cosmogonies. Moses, on the other hand, mentions seven days in connection with creation, not because he had learnt either from tradition or by direct revelation the number of days employed in the creation

o the universe, but because, having found the seven days of the week dedicated to false gods, he proposed to dedicate them instead to the memory of the works of God the Creator. He is regulating *the days of the week*, not writing an account of *the days of creation*.

The second remarkable difference to be noticed between the hymn of Moses and the various ancient accounts of Genesis is to be found in the position assigned by Moses to the sun. Not much is said concerning this luminary in the ancient cosmogonies. Moses, on the other hand, makes very express mention of the creation of the sun, but in a manner which, as we have seen, seems to be utterly at variance with the teaching of all modern and ancient science. In fact, if the statement of Moses regarding the date at which the sun was created is to be accepted as historical, and as implying that the earth existed and revolved on its axis and was clothed with vegetation before the sun, which is the centre of the system of which the earth forms part, had come into existence, it is vain to try to reconcile such a statement with undoubted facts of science. Here again the question forces itself upon us, How comes this most extraordinary statement to be made by Moses alone, while it is never once alluded to by any other writer? The answer is that Moses makes no historical statement as to the date of the creation of the sun. This was a matter which in no way concerned him. What really did concern him in a high degree, occupied as he was in substituting an orthodox dedication of the days of the week in place of the previously existing idolatrous one, was to avoid making any arrangement which might seem to favour in any way the idolatrous notions which the Egyptians and others entertained regarding the sun; notions which the Jews were only too prone to adopt.

The worship of Ra, the physical sun, appears to have been universal throughout Egypt. (Wilkinson, "Manners and Customs of the Egyptians," vol. iii. chap. xiii.) The importance attached to this deity may be readily inferred from the fact of every Pharaoh having the title "Son of the Sun" preceding his phonetic name, and the first name of which their prenomen were composed was that of the sun. In many, too, the phonetic nomen commenced with the name of Ra, as the Ramesses and others; and the expressions "living for ever like the sun," "the splendid Phrê," are common on all obelisks and dedicatory inscriptions. The frequent occurrence of the name Ra, and the great respect paid to the sun, even in towns where other deities presided, tend to show the estimation in which this god was held throughout Egypt. (Wilkinson, *ibid.*)

Nobody knew better than Moses the extent of this worship, and the influence it had upon the people, for it has already been

noticed that he was educated amongst the Priests of the Sun at Heliopolis or On, which was the place where the worship of the sun was peculiarly adopted. Moreover, he was aware that the danger to the Jews of this form of idolatry would not be removed by their departure out of Egypt. The worship of the sun was as prevalent in Palestine as in Egypt.

There is reason to believe that the god Ra corresponded to the Syrian Baal, a name implying "Lord,"* which was given *par excellence* to the sun; and the same idea of peculiar sovereignty was vested in that deity. Heliopolis, in Syria, still retains the name of Baalbeck, "the city of the Lord (or sun)," and the same word occurs in the names of distinguished individuals amongst the Phœnicians and their descendants of Carthage, as Hannibal, Asdrubal, and others. (Wilkinson, *ibid.*)

The worship of the sun being so deeply rooted, both in Egypt and in Palestine, Moses, when suppressing the dedication of the days of the week to the sun, moon, and planets, and substituting in place thereof other dedications to the memory of work done by God the Creator, could not fail to take into account the danger which any prominent mention of the sun might cause to the people. He could not avoid all allusion to this luminary when enumerating the chief works of creation, but he was careful to assign to it such rank in the catalogue as would indicate that it had no claim to any other title but that of a creature of the true God. The first day of the week was dedicated by the heathens to the sun—it was Sunday; *dies solis*. This alone was sufficient to induce Moses not to consecrate that day to the memory of the creation of the sun. Accordingly he chose for that purpose the middle or fourth day of the week; and even then he avoided assigning a special day to the sun, and classified sun, moon, and stars under one head. Ra was worshipped as the fountain of light, "the splendid Phrê." Moses separates light from the sun, and assigns different days to commemorate the creation of the two. Ra was for the Egyptians the source of life; the warmth of his rays brought forth corn and fruit and green herbs, the food of man and every living thing. The heat of the sun is not even alluded to by Moses. An earlier day is dedicated to the memory of the creation of plants than to that of the sun, and special notice is taken of the fact that God (and not Ra) "gave man every herb bearing seed to be meat to him and to all beasts, and every fowl, and to all that move upon the earth and wherein there is life." Thus the language of Moses regarding the sun, which, viewed as an historical statement, appeared to

* As *Beelzebub* or *Baalzebub*, "The Lord of Flies:" *Baalim*, "lords" or "idols."

stand in open contradiction to science both ancient and modern, when viewed as part of a ritual hymn, and interpreted after the manner in which all ritual compositions claim to be interpreted, not only presents no opposition to science, but appears most reasonable, and well adapted for the purpose held in view by the writer. It receives, moreover, a flood of light from the discoveries made of contemporary or quasi-contemporary monuments.

There remains to be noticed a third striking difference between this hymn of Moses and all other accounts of Genesis. "On the seventh day," writes Moses, "God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all the work which he had done. And he blessed the seventh day, because in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made" (Genesis ii. 2, 3). These words appear conclusively to establish the ritual character of the composition in which they occur. Nothing in any way resembling them is to be found in any of the ancient cosmogonies or myths; nor do we meet with any trace of the seventh day of the week being kept holy by any other race of men except the Jews; nor even amongst them does any example of the practice occur prior to their delivery out of Egypt. The examples which are sometimes adduced to prove the contrary are not to the point. Some of them serve to show the antiquity of "the week" as a division of time; others show that there existed from very early times a practice of keeping certain days holy, but there is nothing to connect these days with the seventh day of the week.* The week of seven days was not an invention of Moses; it was known to the Egyptians, Chaldeans, and others long before his time; allusion is made to it in the account of the Deluge in Genesis (Genesis viii. 10, 20). But neither was it communicated to man by a revelation from Heaven. On the contrary, it bears on the face of it evidence of forming part of that early and imperfect system of calculating time by the moon which was first in use amongst men, before the solar year, with its more accurate divisions, had been invented.

* The sacrifice of Job (Job. i. v.) was offered not on the *seventh* but on the *eighth* day; for his seven sons "feasted in their houses, every one his day," and it was only "when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them." The Babylonians had several days of rest in each month, but they were arranged without regard to the days of the week. The 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days of the month were termed "sabbaths," or, "days of rest," when the king was forbidden to eat "cooked fruit" or "meat," or change his clothes, or wear white robes, to drive his chariot, to sit in judgment, to review his army, or even to take medicine should he feel unwell. (Sayce, "Babylonian Literature," p. 55.)

As the moon is the origin of the month, so the week originated with the lunar phases; seven days being the nearest approach that can be made to describe one quarter of the moon, taking a day for the unit.* If the blessing given to the seventh day of the week dates as far back as the creation of man, this complete omission of all allusions to it down to the days of Moses is inexplicable. The Book of Deuteronomy seems plainly to say that the institution dates from the time of the delivery out of Egypt.

The seventh is the day of the Sabbath—that is, the rest of the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not do any work therein, thou nor thy son, nor thy daughter . . . that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest even as thyself. Remember that thou also didst serve in Egypt, and the Lord thy God brought thee out from thence with a strong hand and stretched-out arm. *Therefore* hath he commanded thee that thou shouldst observe the Sabbath day. (Deut. v. 15.)

As circumcision, so the observance of the weekly Sabbath was a distinguishing sign of God's own people. "Speak to the children of Israel and thou shalt say to them, See that thou keep my Sabbath, because it is a sign between me and you in your generations; that you may know that I am the Lord who sanctify you." . . . "It is an everlasting covenant" (Exodus xxxi. 13, 16). It was a particular sign of the Jewish people, even more so than circumcision itself: for the latter was practised by other nations, whereas we are not acquainted with any people except the Jews among whom this particular observance prevailed. And as the observance of the seventh day as a day of rest originated with the Mosaic law, and was confined to places where that law prevailed, so it ceased to be in force as soon as the law of Moses was abrogated. The Lord's Day of the Christian Church is in no sense a continuation of the Jewish

* An express allusion to this origin of the week occurs in one of the "Nineveh tablets." "He caused Nannar (the moon) to shine, and attached it to the night, and he fixed the periods of its nocturnal phases which determine the days. For the entire month without interruption, he established what should be the shape of its disk. At the commencement of the month, when the evening begins, thy horns shall serve thee as a notice to enable thee to determine the time of the heavens. *The seventh day* thou shalt be on thy way to complete thy disk." (See Lenormant, "Les Orig. de l'Hist.," Append. 1, No. iv., Frag. de la 5^{me} tab.). A different translation of this tablet is given by Mr. H. Fox Talbot (R. P. ix. 117), who gives the last line thus: "On the seventh day he appointed a holy day." I am not in a position to judge between Mons. Lenormant and Mr. Talbot; but, if the translation of the latter is correct, it is difficult to see how it came to pass that the Chaldeans did not keep the 7th day holy, but kept instead the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st, and 28th days of the month. See Assyrian Calendar in "Records of the Past," vol. i.; and "Babylonian Literature," by Professor Sayce, p. 55.

Sabbath ; it was instituted to commemorate an entirely different event ; it occurs on the first day of the week, not on the seventh ; and Jews and Christians alike regard the first day of the week not as commemorative of the rest of God, but of the commencement of his work. When the Gentiles embraced Christianity they retained the heathen designation of all the days of the week except the first and the last. The first they called the Lord's day—*dies Dominica*—in honour of the resurrection of our Lord ; for the last, they retained the appellation of Sabbath day—*dies Sabbati*—which they had learnt from the Jews. But though they called it the day of rest, and though that name still adheres to it in languages derived from the Latin, it ceased to be observed as such ; a clear proof that the blessing and sanctification of the seventh day was a ritual ordinance of the law of Moses, and not a primeval revelation made by God to all mankind which no lapse of time could render void.

Attention has already been called to the fact that Moses is the only writer who makes mention of *days* in connection with the works of creation. It must be further observed that although in Scripture there are many allusions to creation, and more than one description of the works of creation, yet never in a single instance is any mention made of *days*, except (as is the case in this hymn of Moses) in connection with this ritual law ordering the seventh day of the week to be kept holy. This clearly shows—first, that the days spoken of are *the days of the week*, not the first seven days at the commencement of time ; and secondly, that the writings in which days are spoken of in connection with the works of creation are ritual works, and must therefore be interpreted after the manner in which such works are usually interpreted. When Moses says : “God made light, and it was evening and morning the first day,” he means the *first day of the week* ; and to say that the making of light was the first day of the week, means that Sunday is consecrated to the memory of the creation of light ; precisely in the same manner as when it is said (in an example recorded above) that the sixth of January is the day on which the Wise Men came from the East to adore the new-born Saviour, the day on which Christ was baptized, and the day on which he changed water into wine ; all that it is meant to imply is that the festival is kept in honour of those three events, not that they actually occurred on that day, it being undoubted that one at least did not.

Before leaving this subject something must be said about the expression “God rested on the seventh day.” What is meant by the rest of God, and why does Moses here introduce the mention of it ? The alternation of periods of activity and repose observable in Nature, has attracted the attention of man from the

earliest ages.* Traces of former disturbances are everywhere to be seen in localities which have since become peaceful scenes of tranquillity and rest. Such facts had not escaped the notice of the Egyptians. Plato in his "Timeus" expressly states that the Egyptians believed the world to be subject from time to time to deluges and conflagrations, after which tranquillity and order were again restored. These violent changes and the subsequent rest were alike ascribed to the interference of the gods. Plutarch tells us that the doctrine of successive creations was imported into Greece from Egypt. The Egyptians, moreover, were in the presence of a constant exemplification of alternate action and rest in the annual inundation of the Nile. This was symbolized in the myth of Osiris and Isis, the worship of which deities was universal throughout Egypt; and the ceremonies commemorative of the finding of the body of Osiris were amongst the most popular in the land.† Moses therefore, both as one learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians and as the legislator of God's people, would not, when referring to the works of creation, omit to notice a fact which had impressed itself alike on the mind of the philosopher and on the superstition of the people. The forces of Nature act in virtue of laws of which God is the author, and inasmuch as the action of secondary causes is rightly referred to a first cause, so the action of Nature's laws is rightly spoken of as the action of God. When the forces of Nature exhibit signs of activity we say that God works; when they lie dormant we say that God rests. The Egyptians referred action and rest alike to false gods; Moses refers both to the Creator of all things. And therefore, as, by reason of the covenant made between God and his people, the seventh day of each week was to be kept holy by abstaining from all servile work, Moses, in dedicating each of the days of the week to the memory of the Creator, most appropriately dedicates the six days on which the Jews were allowed to work to the memory of God working, and the seventh day, on which they were ordered to rest, to the memory of God resting.

Briefly to sum up the argument pursued in the foregoing pages: the first thirty-four verses of the Bible, although they stand foremost in the collection of the writings of Moses, form no portion of the book of Genesis which immediately follows them. They constitute a composition complete in itself. They are a *Sacred Hymn* recording the consecration of each day of the week to the memory of one or other of the works done by the true God, Creator of Heaven and earth, in opposition to a

* See Sir C. Lyell's "Principles of Geology," vol. i. chap. ii.

† See Wilkinson's "Manners and Customs of Egypt," vol. iii. chap. xiii.

custom, established by the Egyptian priests, of referring the days of the week to the sun, moon, and planets, and of consecrating each day of the month to the memory of the actions of false deities. The hymn, when examined by the light which a knowledge of the customs of Egypt, such as may at the present day be derived from the monuments and records of that country, throws upon it, shows how carefully its details have been arranged for the purpose of guarding against those special dangers of idolatry to which the Israelites were exposed at the time of their delivery from Egyptian bondage; thus affording an indirect but valuable confirmation of the fact that Moses was its author. This hymn not being a history of creation, but a ritual, work, the statements contained in it must be interpreted in the sense in which similar statements are understood when they occur in writings of a ritual character. When it is said that certain works were performed on certain days of the week, nothing more is implied than that those days are consecrated to the memory of the works referred to. Subject to this proviso, the words of Moses are to be understood in their usual sense, and present no special difficulty. *A day* means the space of twenty-four hours in this as in other portions of the writings of the same author. By the seven days are meant the days of the week, which are simply referred to as the first, second, instead of Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, and so on, because, all reference to the names derived from the planets being forbidden, there remained but the numerical order by which to cite them. Words descriptive of natural objects and phenomena, such as the firmament, the deep, the waters above the firmament, and such like, mean nothing more nor less than what was implied by the same words when used by the Wise Men of Egypt in the days of Moses. The notions of these men were wrong on many points of natural philosophy, but their error lay in the interpretation they gave to the phenomena; the phenomena themselves had a real existence. The language of Moses refers to the phenomena independently of any interpretation which may be given of the same. At the present day we speak of the stars shining in the sky, the rain pouring down from the sky, the rainbow appearing in the sky, though we are well aware that the stars are removed far above the atmosphere in which the rain gathers which reflects the rainbow. Thus understood, the words of Moses present no manner of opposition to scientific facts. In his hymn he records two things—first, that God alone created all things. This is a truth which no scientific fact can invalidate. Secondly, that each of the first six days of the week is consecrated to the memory of some special work performed by God, and that the seventh is consecrated to the memory of the rest of

God, and must be kept holy. This ritual ordinance has almost entirely ceased. We have resumed the heathen custom of calling the days of the week after the names of the planets, the observance of the seventh day as a day of rest has been abolished, and a different festival, not connected with the rest of God, has been established in its place.* As to the order in which the various parts of creation came into existence, and whether a longer or shorter period of time elapsed before our earth and its furniture assumed the appearance they now present, these are matters which form no part of Moses' task to explain. They enter not into his subject, and he does not allude to them, and, therefore, whatever be the conclusions which scientific men may come to on these points, they meet neither with approval nor with opposition from the words of Moses. The records of the early stages of the existence of our globe form, no doubt, a subject of great interest to inquirers, but, beyond the fact that in the beginning God created Heaven and earth, no revelation has been given to man concerning them. They belong exclusively to the province of science. They are part of that *travail which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised in it. He hath made all things good in their time, and hath delivered the world to their consideration* (Eccles. iii. 10, 11).

WILLIAM CLIFFORD,

Bishop of Clifton.

* A trace of the Jewish method of counting the days of the week by their numbers, as also of counting festivals from evening to evening, is still observable in the ecclesiastical calendar. The dedication of the days of the week to the works of creation is also referred to in the hymns of the ferial office. A decree of St. Silvester, Pope (A.D. 314), is quoted as confirming this mode of numeration. "He (St. Silvester) decreed that the first and seventh days of the week should be called respectively the Lord's day and the Sabbath, and the others second day, third day, and so on. In this he confirmed the use of the word *feria* for the week days, the which use had already begun in the Church. This word signifieth an "holiday," and pointeth to the duty of the clergy ever to lay aside all worldly labour and leave themselves free to do continually the work of the Lord.—*The Roman Breviary*, translated by the Marquess of Bute. Vol. i. p. 250.

ART. V.—THE "CORPUS MISSAL" AND ITS
PROBABLE DATE.

The Manuscript Irish Missal belonging to the President and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by F. E. WARREN, B.D. London: Pickering & Co. 1879.

THE 'Corpus' Irish Missal, which has lain for centuries unnoticed in the library of Oxford University, is the property of its Fellows, and has been lately edited by one of them, Rev. Mr. Warren, Professor of Celtic. The Missal contains not only a considerable number of Masses, common and proper, and a still greater number of Commemorations, but even a Ritual for the Administration of the Sacraments of Baptism, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony. All is written in the Irish character.

1. The editor has not treated us to a lithographed or phot zincographed reproduction of the Corpus Missal; but there is every reason for believing that he has given us a very faithful copy of it. Every page gives indication of care and skill on the part of the editor; and though the contents of the dateless book do not offer such striking contrasts to the comparatively modern form of the liturgy as those edited by Le Brun, Martene, and Mabillon, yet they are not without interest and utility for purposes of comparison. The Missal should be in the hands of every antiquarian and ecclesiastic.

2. Nothing could be more satisfactory than the manner in which the editor has given almost every part of the Missal. I say *almost* every part, for I except the litanies. They are so given that not one person in a thousand could repeat them properly or in the manner intended by their writer.

In old manuscripts, for the purpose of economizing space, as well as in some printed books, the litanies were given in double columns. But the natural order requires that we finish the left column before we turn to the right, or that at least there should be a marked break in the first column to warn us off to the other column. Nothing of this sort occurs in many passages of the Corpus Missal. Hence, in a column of twenty-three petitions, after the fifth petition we are driven to the top of the next column in order to repeat *Sancta Virgo Virginum* immediately after *Sancta Dei genetrix, ora pro nobis*. And then, after the fifth petition in the second column, we are thrown back to the first column.*

* "Missale Vetus," p. 133.

3. The same fault is repeated in the litany used in blessing the baptismal water as well as in the litany on Holy Saturday; because after St. Gabriel comes as close as possible St. Philip, without a shadow of a break, which is wrong, and we are driven to look out for St. Raphael in the next column; and then, after invoking St. James, without the smallest break or warning we come on St. Cyprian, who should not be invoked till after the saints of the first column.

4. Then in a third litany—that for the dying—confusion is still more confounded. For in order to observe proper continuity in the invocation of saints we must turn over a leaf, and turn back again for the second column.*

5. It may be observed that the saints invoked in Irish litanies were in the following order—the Virgin Mary, St. Michael, St. John Baptist, SS. Peter and Paul. St. Michael represented the angelic host, St. John the saints of the Old Law, and SS. Peter and Paul those of the New Law; but beyond and above all was invoked the intercession of the Mother of God. This arrangement was borrowed, no doubt, from old Roman rituals. Certain it is that the Church by-and-by incorporated, even in its liturgy, the same order in the invocation of saints as represented in the *Confiteor*.

6. While on the whole the editing of the Corpus Missal may be said to be a very creditable performance, the same praise cannot be extended to its fifty-one pages of introductory matter. The editor, in an unconnected paragraph, gratuitously implies or asserts the Protestant character of the Irish Church in the twelfth century. Thus, in p. 45, he says: "In the year 1152, at a National Synod held at Kells, the supremacy of Rome was acknowledged by many of the clergy." Here it is implied that some or many denied the supremacy. This is a statement for which he brings forward no proof, for the very good reason that no proof is producible. The contrary is established by an irresistible mass of evidence, by tradition, by the practices and documents of the Irish Church.†

A denial of the supremacy should not be hazarded on slight grounds, if there were no other reason in proof of it than the Roman mission of St. Patrick. Not to mention individual Irish writers who testify to the supremacy of Rome, the "Book of Armagh," representing the traditions and practices of the Church, declares that in all more than ordinary difficulties recourse should be had for guidance to the See of Rome.‡

So, too, when there had been question of changing the disci-

* "Missale Vetus," 211.

† *Vid.* Malone's "Church History," vol. i. p. 108.

‡ Fol. 21.

pline in regard to the time for the celebration of Easter, the Irish bishops and doctors of the Church met; and in their doubts the teaching of the Irish Church in regard to the supremacy is brought out by the decision arrived at—that they should have recourse to Rome, the founder and mistress of religion.*

It were an endless task to cite the opinions of individual theologians from age to age in support of Roman supremacy in Ireland; but we may rest assured that the writer in the venerable "Leabhar Breac" only echoed the teaching of Irish doctors on the matter. It states that "Christ loved John more than any other of the human race, and that Peter more than John loved Christ, and therefore He gave the headship of his Church not to John, but to Peter."† Nothing could be more clear or decisive than this statement.

7. In the absence of profound liturgical knowledge, the editor might have been spared several minor mistakes by correct notions on the Papal supremacy. His "bonâ fide differences" of texts found in the ancient Celtic church from the Vulgate would easily be accounted for by remembering that the old Vulgate or *Itala* was brought by St. Patrick into Ireland. Thus, to his preconceived notions on Roman supremacy is traceable the statement (p. 22) that "for the Roman word *introitus* the word *antiphon* was used in the Corpus Missal, an Irish peculiarity," because in the eighth and ninth centuries the word *antiphon* was usually employed in Roman Missals. It was called the *ingressa* in Mozarabic Missals, and the *office* in Carthusian Missals.‡

8. It is from wrong notions on the supremacy the editor of the Corpus Missal fixes its ancient *habitat* in Clones: he says (in p. 51) in it "there is a votive 'Mass de Petro et Paulo,' &c., and to them the Abbey of Clones was dedicated."

Let me observe that, in the place referred to, there is no votive Mass given, but a mere commemoration of SS. Peter and Paul, preceded by some commemorations, and followed by sixteen others on various feasts, as found at present toward the end of the Roman Missal.

Special devotion to SS. Peter and Paul, as heads of the saints of the New Law, was not confined to Ireland, much less to any convent in Ireland; and, therefore, cannot afford a clue to the *habitat* of the Missal. In good truth, all Irish litanies and the six Irish masses extant,§ no matter in what convent written,

* AA. SS. Hib. "Vita S. Finiani," et p. 474.

† Agus araisin tra is do Petur tuc Criost cendacht na heclaissi. "Leabhar Breac," p. 148, col. 1.

‡ Bened. xiv., "Sacrif. Missæ," lib. ii. chap. iv.

§ Malone's "Church History," vol. ii., Appendices.

exhibit a marked devotion to SS. Peter and Paul, especially to the former.

Thus the first prayer for mass in the Irish Stowe Missal is *Oratio prima Petri*.

Again, in the still older mass in the Bobio Missal the first prayer is "*Deus qui beato Petro Apostolo tuo conlatis clavis,*" &c.

9. It is to peculiar notions on the Supremacy we are probably indebted for a statement in p. 40 of the Introduction: "There were the offices which the itinerant monkish priest would from time to time be called to perform . . . and by performing which he encroached, sometimes uninvited, on the province of the secular clergy."

There is a great deal of inaccuracy in this statement. Whether used in a derivative or conventional sense, the word "monk" is improperly applied to a regular priest. A fundamental rule in the legislation of the Church was directed against an itinerant monk—*monachus vagus*; and if one of the community had been raised to the priesthood, his ministrations were confined to the precincts of the monastery. So marked is the difference between a monk and a regular priest, that in processions the former, though unordained, takes precedence of the latter.*

But mainly objectionable is the statement that the conventual priest, by using the Corpus Missal, encroached on the secular clergy. Some Religious had districts assigned to them with the care of souls, and such were those for whom the Corpus Missal was written. These sometimes discharged the duties even of secular canons, and were called Culdees. Their jurisdiction was often and immemorially independent of the secular clergy. Such had been the Culdees of Iniscathys. Such independent jurisdiction, too, was enjoyed by the Culdees of Armagh† and Devenish. And, by the way, there is some reason for thinking that it was in either of these latter convents that the Corpus Missal was written.

The very rubrics directed that the *people* were to approach the Church as a matter of course rather than that the priest should stealthily or encroachingly assist them. Thus, in the reception of the Sacrament of Matrimony the contracting parties and their friends were to have been in the church. Thus, too, at the ceremony of Adoration of the Cross on Good Friday, after the priests and deacons and other ecclesiastical ministers came the people. So, too, was a discourse on the occasion to be addressed to the people.‡

* *Vid.* "*Acta ex iis decerpta, quæ apud sanctam Sedem,*" &c.

† *Vid.* "*Mey's Registry.*"

‡ "*Missale Vetus,*" p. 125.

Once again, the presence of the people from the surrounding district of the convent is supposed by the presentation of candles on the Feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin.* So far were these ceremonies from being "offices which the itinerant monkish priest was to perform," that the very rubrics suppose a pomp and ceremony befitting a cathedral church, and assert the presence of deacon, sub-deacon, dean, chantor, *hebdomadarius*, and even bishop, as certainly as the Antiphony of Armagh.†

10. As regards the age of the Missal, the learned editor reminds us that it must be determined on (1) palæographic grounds, (2) on liturgical evidence, and (3) on internal historical allusions, and concludes that there can be little doubt that "the Missal was written between the years 1152 and 1157."

11. Touching the palæographic grounds, we are helplessly in the hands of the editor, as we have not had a glimpse of the Missal. To console us, however, we are assured that palæography can afford no clue for determining the age of the Missal, owing "to the habit of Irish scribes to perpetuate by exact imitation of every detail the smallest peculiarities." This view of Irish palæographical evidence is very questionable. There may have been a very faithful copying of the original, even in its inaccuracies, from time to time, but it is not unlikely that the style of writing and ornamentation varied in different ages. Why, in point of ornamentation and finish there is as much difference between several Irish manuscripts as between a cartoon and a painting by one of the masters! Who for a moment, setting aside the character of the writing, could think of even comparing the "Book of Durrow" with the "Leabhar Breac?" In looking into Irish manuscripts, from the "Book of Dimma" at the end of the sixth century to those in the fifteenth century, can one fail being struck by the marked difference in the series? This difference was so marked as to have made O'Donovan give us specimens of various forms of Irish writing characteristic of different ages.‡ Hence it was that O'Curry undertook to exhibit styles of writing in the Irish language as characteristic of each century from the sixth down to his own time.§

Not to speak at all of the style of ornamentation, we are led to observe the several varieties in the formation of letters, and thus determine the age of the writing. By looking narrowly into manuscripts we can trace 15 varieties in the letter *a*, 6 in *b*, 5 in *c*, 7 in *d*, 9 in *e*, 3 in *f*, 5 in *g*, 9 in *h*, 2 in *i*, 8 in *l*, 2 in *m*, 5 in *n*, 5 in *o*, 1 in *p*, 1 in *q*, 16 in *r*, 2 in *s*, and 6 in *t*. The

* "Missale Vetus," p. 147.

† Ir. Gr. Plates.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 125, 147, 203.

§ "MSS. Materials," Appendices.

utilizing this source alone of evidence would lead to an approximate conjecture as to the date of writing.

12. As regards the second ground for determining the age of the Corpus Missal—liturgical evidence—it is as barren of results as the first in the hands of Mr. Warren. "More significant" than anything he had previously stated "is the absence from the Canon of the words *pro quibus tibi offerimus vel*, generally inserted in the Canon in the eleventh century." These words were generally in the Canon in the twelfth century, and have been commented on by Pope Innocent III. in the thirteenth century.* But these words, while they have been found in the oldest manuscript Missals, as Mabillon acknowledged, have been omitted in others;† and thus, so far as these words are concerned, we are left to assign the Corpus Missal to any century from the fifth to the twelfth.

This would not be of much use in determining the age of the Missal, but I venture to say, however, that a more potent spirit is latent in the liturgical field, which I hope by-and-by to evoke.

13. The third ground—historical allusions—is that on which the editor mainly, if not altogether, relies for ascertaining the age of the Missal; and his conclusion is that it was written in the twelfth century, "soon after the last vestiges of the old national rite and of liturgical and ritual independence were swept away under St. Malachi" (p. 44, *Introduction*).

Now I beg to assure him that vestiges of the old Irish liturgies continued for centuries after the age of St. Malachi. One of the reasons assigned for applying for the erection of the Wardenship of Galway in the fifteenth century was that the tribes wished to have their religious rites carried out according to the Salisbury use, and that they should not be interrupted in them by the Celts or their practices.‡ So, too, Robert, who was promoted from Canterbury to the diocese of Clonfert in the year 1303, obtained as a privilege that he might be allowed the use of the offices of the Church of Clonfert rather than the English offices.§

14. The editor of the Missal, in introducing us to the real age of the Missal, reminds us that its date limits the lateness but not the earliness at which it may have been written. In proof of the great antiquity of some of it he refers to a prayer in a Mass or rather a Commemoration of St. Patrick. In this prayer allusion

* "De mysterio Missæ," lib. iii. cap. 6.

† Pouget, "Institut. Catholicar." tom. ii. p. 853.

‡ Theiner, "Vetera Monumenta," an. 1484. § *Ibid.*, sub. an. 1307.

is made to the errors of *gentilism* or idolatry in which the Irish or *Scots* were plunged.*

Now with regard to the term *Scoti* being used for *Hibernenses*, or Irish, in the prayer, very little is established by it. It is of little use to show that a term or phrase was in use in remote antiquity unless its use be shown to have ceased within a later period. Otherwise the most gained is that a form of language or a phrase may be said, but cannot be proved, to be archaic. Of this character is the word *Scoti*; for it was very common down to the eleventh century.† Even in the fourteenth century its use is inferrible. In the famous remonstrance addressed by the Irish chieftains in 1316 to Pope John XXII., previous to the invasion by the Bruces, it is stated that Scotland was *Scotia Minor* and that Ireland is *Scotia Major*.‡

Nor does the allusion to the original *gentilism* or paganism of the Irish establish in any way the antiquity of the prayer. The terms *gentes* and *gentilitas* (pagans and paganism) became loan-words in the Irish language and were in common use in the fourteenth century.§ So far from establishing the antiquity claimed for the prayer of St. Patrick is the allusion to pagans that the same allusion is made in the prayer found in the present Roman Breviary.|| The *gentes* in the present Roman Breviary in reference to St. Patrick is the same as the *gentilitas* of the Corpus Missal.

15. Nor does the allusion to the *spirituale sacrificium* in the commemorative post-communion in honour of St. Patrick necessarily prove the antiquity of the prayer. The phrase is pointed to as occurring in the Stowe Missal, written in the seventh century. It is very curious that it is one of the only three phrases selected out of the entire Corpus Missal by the editor for comment, and still more curious that Dr. Todd, in a notice of an "ancient Irish Missal," should have dwelt with emphasis on the same phrase.¶ He went so far as to charge Dr. O'Connor, librarian to the Duke of Buckingham, with omitting to give it, whereas he did not undertake to give more than extracts from and specimens of the contents of the Stowe Missal; and, more

* *Oratio*. "Deus qui sanctum Patritium Scotorum apostolum tua providentia elegisti, ut hibernenses gentes in tenebris et in errore gentilitatis errantes," &c.

† "Sroll—id est solli unde apud *Scoticos*: dia sroll—i.e., dies solis."—Cormac's "Glossary."

‡ Fordun, "Scoto-chronicon," vol. iii. sub. an. 1316.

§ Thus in the "Leabhar Breac," p. 258, col. 2, *genti, gentiu, gentlidgecht*.

|| *Oratio*. "Deus qui ad predicandas gentes beatum Patritium &c. mittere dignatus es." Rom. Breviar. 17th March.

¶ "Tr. R. I. A." vol. xxiii.

curious still, Dr. O'Connor, in point of fact, does give the passage in which the phrase is, with the very phrase *spirituale sacrificium*. Dr. Todd in addressing a non-polemical body could not say: "Remark the Protestant language, or the language to which we attach Protestant ideas," but it is easy to read between the lines; and that which the Academy did allow him to say, but what truth could not warrant him to do, he did say—that *spirituale sacrificium* had been omitted by the Catholic librarian.

Now if *spirituale sacrificium* means, as I contend, *mystical oblation*, it expresses Catholic doctrine in language used in the nineteenth as well as in the seventh century. *Spiritual* was understood by Irish writers to mean not what was unreal but mystical, as opposed to what was sensible. In this sense the accurate writer in the famous "Leabhar Breac" understood the word. *Spirituale* is given in a number of places as synonymous with *runda*—that is, "mystic."* *Spirituale* was used in opposition to "carnal," and it is in this sense St. Augustine sometimes understood the word.† *Spirituale* was not opposed to substance; on the contrary, it expressed reality, though mystical.‡ Then, as to the word *sacrificium* it will be understood as a convertible term for *oblation*. Hence in the Stowe Missal, from which the objection has been drawn, we read, in the prayer by St. Ambrose: "Forgive the unworthy priest through whose hands this *oblation* appears to be offered."§ As a matter of course, *oblation* being convertible for *sacrificium*, and *spirituale* for *mystic*, *spirituale sacrificium* means, and is convertible into, "mystic oblation," and this is the very phrase used by the Church to-day in reference to the Mass.|| If, then, the same language is found in the nineteenth century as in the seventh, all that follows is that it could have been used, not that

* "Leabhar Breac," p. 196, cols. 1, 2; and p. 168, col. 2.

† "Panem cœlestem spiritaliter manducate." "Hom." *Trac.* 26 in *Johannem*.

‡ "Non solum in *mystica* nunc et *vera* Dei adoratione, sed nec in illa in qua *sacrificium* secundum legem in *figura* offerebatur."—St. Basil, "Hom." 1, *de jejuniis ante-medium*.

§ This idea is more fully explained in the "Vision of Adamnan:" "Ar ni he inscart do gni inedpartsin iter, cid he accithaid iconitimtrecht, acht is u cr. fen do gni comfhod agus ben da chaid inabairgine agus infina aforaicnid achuirp agus a fola fen intan chanus inscart na briara chan christ." "Leabhar Breac," p. 237, col. 1, 9th line from bottom: "Since it is not the priest at all who performs the sacrifice, though his ministration is visible, but Jesus Christ Himself, Who blesses and changes the bread and wine into the real nature of his own very body and blood at the time the priest utters the words once pronounced by Christ Himself."

|| "Secreta: *mystica* nobis, Domine, prosit *oblatio*." "Mass for St. Calixtus," 14th October.

it had been actually used, in a certain book at a very early period.

16. Without dwelling further on incidental issues I come, to the consideration of the date of the Corpus Missal as a whole; and in doing so I find that the historical allusions in it are, in the hands of the editor, as barren of results as the palæographical or liturgical grounds. In a litany usual on Easter Eve there are found in the Missal the petitions "that thou wouldst deign to preserve the King of the Irish and his army; that thou wouldst grant them life, health, and victory, we beseech thee;"* in a litany for the baptismal service is found the petition "deign to preserve that Lord the King and the Christian army in perpetual peace and prosperity;"† and on Holy Saturday there is a prayer "for our most glorious King N. and his most noble offspring."‡

Now these three different entries are the only historical grounds on which the editor of the Corpus Missal founds an argument for determining its age. They are far less calculated to fix the age of the Missal than the three phrases in the prayers to St. Patrick were calculated to claim for it a very high antiquity.

From the introduction of Christianity into Ireland till the Anglo-Norman invasion, we had Irish kings, and their armies, and their children; and therefore the mention of any of these in a prayer proves nothing at all to the case in point. The mention of the King and his illustrious offspring in the prayer on Holy Saturday would render the editor's conjecture probable enough if he had proved that the Missal had been written in the twelfth century. But he has not proved, and I believe could not prove, its date to be assigned to that century, and therefore entirely groundless is his conjecture that the glorious father and most noble son mean Torlogh O'Connor, and his son Roderick, the last King of Ireland.

17. A writer in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* of last September, in an interesting analysis of the contents of the Corpus Missal—while maintaining that the eleventh century, not the twelfth, is the age of the Missal, charges the editor with both ignoring some of the historical facts supplied in it, and not rightly interpreting those actually quoted. The writer would put into evidence the following prayers. One is a commemoration for the King: "Receive, O Lord, the prayers and victims of thy Church praying to Thee for the salvation of thy servant, our King,

* "Ut Regem Hibernensium et exercitum ejus conservare digneris; ut eis vitam, sanitatem, et victoriam dones, te rogamus."

† "Ut dominum illum regem, et exercitum Christianorum in perpetua pace et prosperitate digneris."

‡ "Pro gloriosissimo rege nostro N, ejusque nobilissima prole."

and in protection of thy faithful people display the wonders of thy power as of old ; so that, the enemies of peace being overcome, Christian liberty may be at thy service." The other prayer is one for the emperor on Holy Saturday: "Let us pray for our most Christian emperor." The writer in the *Record* infers from these two prayers, coupled with the fact that in one instance Brian Boru was called Emperor of the Scots, "that there can be little difficulty in verifying these allusions from our native annals." Now I venture to assert that these do not prove any thing more than the prayers given by the editor of the Missal. The historical allusions referred to by the latter prove nothing; the two prayers relied on by the writer in the *Record* do not, to my mind, apply to Ireland. It may not be denied that Brian Boru on an occasion was referred to in an entry as emperor; but the word was used in its etymological and original meaning, owing to the stand which he made in the field against the Danish enemy. But it is quite a different thing to have one styled emperor in the liturgy of the Church and prayed for. There was one emperor, and only one, for whom prayers were said in the public liturgy by the Western Church. This prayer has been very properly omitted by the editor of the Missal, as not at all applicable to Ireland. The prayers for king and emperor relied on by the writer in the *Record* are only imitations of the prayers in the Roman Missal of the day.*

By looking at the prayers given at present at the end of the Roman Missal, we find commemorations of the pope, emperor, kings, bishops, and the several grades in Church and State, suitable to the wants and devotion of each branch of the Church; but as a vestige of ancient discipline, we find it to some extent in the office of Holy Saturday binding on the universal Church. Thus we find that the prayer for the king in Corpus Missal is only a modified form of that found even in the present Roman Missal.

By the way, I have to observe, in reference to this matter, that the editor of the Missal has not been as faultless as I represented him; for the prayer for the king, which he says is not found in the Roman Missal, may be seen in that for an emperor.†

Prayers, in the primitive ages of the Church, were ordinarily

* Post Communion in Corpus Missal: "Hæc, Domine, communicio salutaris famulum tuum regem nostrum ab omnibus tueatur adversis, quatenus ecclesiasticæ pacis obtineat tranquillitatem et post istius (Hujus. Roman Missal) temporis decursum ad æternam perveniat hæreditatem."

† *Oratio* (from Corpus Missal,) *pro rege*: "Quæsumus omnipotens Deus, ut famulus tuus rex noster qui tuo nutu (miseratione, "Roman Missal") suscepit regni gubernacula virtutum etiam percipiat incrementa

said for the Pope, the Ordinary of the particular diocese, for the Emperor, for the King, and for all orders in Church and State.

The prayer for the emperor in the Corpus Missal, running thus, will easily be seen to be a transcript of the Roman Missal. "Let us pray for our most Christian emperor, N., that God may subject all barbarous nations to him, and make him understand what is right, and bear away victory and triumph over the enemies of the Catholic and Apostolic Church to our perpetual peace."* That in the Roman, even at present, runs thus: "Let us pray for our most Christian emperor, that God and our Lord may make all barbarous nations subject to him for our perpetual peace." Who does not see that both prayers refer to the same object and that one was copied from the other?

After the *levate*, sung by the deacon, we have the prayer in the Corpus Missal almost identical with that in the present Roman Missal. "O almighty, everlasting God, in whose hands are the rights of all and the jurisdiction of all kingdoms, regard the Christian (Roman) empire, so that the nations relying on their fierceness may be crushed by the power of thy right hand."† Now how could this be applied to an Irish sovereign? Is it not evidently copied from the Roman Missal, and to be understood in the like sense? Who could think that such a prayer could refer to the Danes and Brian Boru, as the writer in the *Record* would have us believe?

It is not merely that some territory, no matter how considerable, should be subjected to the Irish kingdom and people, but that nations should be subject to them—ay, that *all barbarous nations* should be subject to a potentate in an insignificant remote island.

Then, again, the idea of a prayer for the Emperor upsets the idea

quibus decenter ornatus et vitiorum voraginem (monstra, "Roman Missal") devitare et a te qui via, veritas, et vita es gratosus valeat pervenire."

The secret prayer for king in Corpus Missal is found in the prayer for an emperor: "Suscipe, Domine, preces et hostias Ecclesiæ tuæ pro salute famuli tui supplicantis, et in protectione fidelium populorum antiqua brachii tui operare miracula ut superatis pacis inimicis secunda tibi serviat Christiana libertas."

* From Corpus Missal: "Oremus et pro Christianissimo imperatore nostro N. ut Deus et dominus noster subditas illi faciat omnes barbaras nationes, et faciat sapere ea quæ recta sunt, atque contra inimicos Catholicæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ triumphum largiatur victoriæ ad nostram perpetuam pacem." From the Roman Missal: "Oremus et pro Christianissimo Imperatore nostro N. ut Deus et Dominus noster subditas illi faciat omnes barbaras nationes ad nostram perpetuam pacem."—"Prayer on Good Friday."

† "Omnipotens sempiterne Deus in cujus manu sunt omnium potestates et omnia jura regnorum respice ad Christianorum ('Romanum,' R. Missal) benignum imperium ut gentes qui in sua feritate confidunt potentie tuæ dextra comprimantur."—Corpus Missal.

that there was a king in the same country. We have prayers for both in the Corpus Missal as in the Roman Missal. This is quite natural and compatible only with the supposition that each country was supposed to have its own king, but that there was only one emperor for the Latin Church. Hence, in countries where the ruler was both king and emperor, commemoration was made for him daily; it was only on certain occasions, as on Good Friday, special commemoration was made for him through the universal Latin Church.

18. Owing to the Saracens in the South of Europe, and the pagan infidels in the North, the Western Empire, especially during the ninth and tenth centuries, was called the Christian Empire. By-and-by, and especially when the Moors had been driven out of Spain, when the North was brought within the Christian fold it was called the Roman empire, in contradistinction to the Greek empire. Whether Carlovingian or German, whether sprung from the House of Hapsburg or Bavaria, no matter in what part of Western Christendom residing, there was only one Emperor for whom prayers were offered in the liturgy on Holy Saturday.

19. It cannot then be shown from the prayers said for King or Emperor that the Missal was written in the twelfth or eleventh century.

The argument of those who endeavour to prove this fails doubly. It fails both in the major and minor premises. The writer in the *Ecclesiastical Record*, adopting the language of the editor of the Corpus Missal, says: "These clauses yield a clue to the date, unless we are to believe without any show of reason that a later scribe slavishly copied words which, under altered circumstances, could have no meaning at all."* The argument, put more in form, states that the prayers for king and emperor give a clue to the date of the Missal, unless we suppose, what is absurd, that a scribe slavishly copied what did not apply to existing circumstances. The position depends on a conditional proposition, and the conditions are not verified. Whether there was a servile copying or not, no clue is afforded by the entries given. Besides, it may be maintained that there had been servile copying on the part of the Irish scribe. In fact, as stated before, the editor of the Missal admits the difficulty of determining any thing from the writing, so slavishly did the Irish scribes give every peculiarity of the original. In p. 33 of the Introduction he instances, "as cases of carelessness, eight principal vices alluded to, though immediately afterwards only seven are specified." Now I have reason to think that there was neither carelessness nor

* "I. E. R.," p. 512: Corpus Missal, p. 47, Introduction.

inaccuracy on the part of the Irish scribe. He only copied faithfully what was written by others. For I have seen the same confusion repeated in Irish manuscripts, and in more places than one. In one of the places alluded to, the case was reversed; seven capital sins only were alluded to, while eight were actually given.* I repeat, then, that we *can* suppose an Irish scribe slavishly coping, without exercising any critical judgment.

20. We know that in ancient times the Paschal feast began at dusk on Easter Eve, so that the Mass would be gone through at midnight. Circumstances have altered the discipline of the Church, which at present anticipates the offices on Saturday morning, and yet the same form of words is *slavishly copied* and used as before.†

And to bring the matter more home, we have an illustration and strongest proof in the matter under consideration—prayer for the Emperor.

We know that, from the days of Charlemagne till the Western Emperor and Empire disappeared before the legions of Napoleon, mention of the Roman empire and prayers for it were found in the liturgy.

But as Frederick Joseph resigned the title and dignity, it became a question whether the prayers for an emperor of the Western Empire should continue. The case was submitted to the Holy See. The decision was that, *though circumstances altered*, in each edition of the Roman Missal the prayer should be *slavishly copied* or printed, though no longer verified by actual circumstances.‡ I therefore repeat that Irish scribes and English printers *can* be supposed reproducing what was applicable only to altered circumstances, and meaningless as interpreted by existing circumstances; and, what is the main point, I reassert that, whether unmeaningly copied or not, the prayers give no warrant to date the Missal for the eleventh or twelfth century.

Having now shown, as I consider, that no evidence has been

* "Leabhar Breac," p. 58, p. 250, col. 1 and 2.

† On this subject there is a decision of the S. Cong. 12th March, 1861: "In conclusione orationis, Deus qui hanc sacratissimam noctem, &c., verbum *ejusdem* delendum est."—*Obeata nox*, &c.

‡ "Gardellini, sub voce *Oratio imperata*, n. 4835 ad vi. die 7 Dec. 1844; n. 5012 ad 3 die 15 Junii 1845."

"Queritur ergo 1. : An prædictæ orationes expungendæ sint in novis Missalis Romani editionibus?—S. R. C. resp. Negative. Et quatenus negative: an ad utramque Orationem brevis apponi debeat rubrica, qua declaratur eas (in Parasceve ac Sabbato S.) hodie esse omittendas?—S. R. C. resp. Negative."

"Et quatenus negative: An saltem istius modi adnotatio apponi debeat initio Missalis post rubricas generales inter decreta sacrorum Rituum Congregationis?—S. R. C. resp. Affirmative, die 25, Sept., 1860."

adduced for determining the date of the Corpus Missal, it only remains for me to express my conviction that it belongs to a period earlier by 300 years than the date assigned to it by its editor. There is only one thing that raises any hesitation, and it is this; the mention of carpets in connection with the blessing of candles on the Feast of the Purification.* Very respectable authorities maintain that carpets were not in general use before the thirteenth century.† It is stated that, in the year 1160, St. Thomas à Becket's apartments were strewn with clean straw and hay daily; that it was only in the reign of Henry IV. of France the custom of weaving woollen carpets was introduced into France from Persia; and that the use of carpets even in the fourteenth century was a luxury. On the other hand, it may be said that the portion of the manuscript referring to the carpets is not as old as the other portion, or that it is not certain that carpets had not been in general use before the twelfth century. And even though their general use was not so early as the twelfth century, yet there may have been legislation in regard to them as to the use of wearables, "that it is not lawful for any one to use satin in a garment unless in the chasuble for sacrifice."‡

On the whole, then, I entertain a well-grounded opinion that the Missal was written before the twelfth century, and I proceed to give some reasons for that opinion.

21. In the Corpus Missal there is mention (in p. 103) of Quinquagesima Sunday in connection with the beginning of Lent, which proves the Missal to have been written before even the tenth century. It may be observed that in the early ages of the Church there existed great diversity as to the time of beginning Lent. The sixth Sunday before Easter is now called "Quadragesima" Sunday, and the time intervening between it and Easter Sunday is called "Quadragesima" time. But as six Sundays should be deducted from the forty-two days in six weeks for purposes of fasting, the Lent commenced on the previous Sunday,§ Quinquagesima Sunday, in order to

* "Ibique prosternantur tapetæ."—*Missale Vetus*, 147.

† Hadyn's "Dictionary of Dates," under word *tapestry*.

‡ "Leabhar Breac," p. 108, col. 2.

§ Irish writers state that *some* were satisfied with beginning Lent on Quadragesima Sunday, as even thus they were enabled to give a *tithe* of the year to God. "Et quibusdam sex dies dominici abstinence subtrahuntur." The six Sundays were exempted not from a spirit of immortification, but to honour the Lord's day: "Uair ni cubaid aine vel abstanaít vel troscud do denum in domnach."—"Leabhar Breac," p. 47, col. 1. But though it was more congruous to relax the fast on Sunday, yet there was no obligation to do so, if one wished to imitate the austerity of the hermits of the desert. On that account the writer stated that *some* did not fast on Sundays. *Vid.* "Leabhar Breac," p. 54-55.

supply the four additional days required to make up the forty days that could not possibly be reckoned within the Quadragesima time. Those who did not wish to observe the four days' fast in one week, then began the Lent on the next previous Sunday, Sexagesima; and for a like reason some began it even earlier, on Septuagesima Sunday; and thus spread the four days' fast over the three weeks between Septuagesima and Quadragesima Sundays.

By-and-by, however, in the first part of the ninth century, for the sake of uniformity of discipline, the Church decreed that the fast of Lent should begin on the Wednesday previous to Quadragesima Sunday, in order to secure forty days of continuous fast, in imitation of our Redeemer.

There is a clue to this earlier discipline clearly afforded by the Rubric at the beginning of Lent. It is marked "Dominica in L;" showing that the Lent began, not as in other Churches, on Septuagesima or Sexagesima Sunday, but on Quinquagesima.

But the Editor of the *Corpus*, viewing the past through the medium of the present discipline, judged L to be a mistake; prefixed X to it, in order that the time for beginning Lent should harmonize with his present views, and thus put out, rather than followed, the light afforded by the Rubric for determining the age of the Missal.

The Rubric, then, in reference to the older discipline, changed about 850,* proves the Missal to have been written before the tenth century.

22. (1) There is no *Prose* in the *Corpus Missal*. Now we might expect the prose *Victimæ Paschali* in the Easter Mass, and the *Veni Sancte* in the Mass of Pentecost, if they had been in existence; and, as they were composed in the eleventh century,† we must infer that the *Corpus Missal* was before the eleventh century.

Besides, Notker Balbulus, supposed to be Irish, and famously connected with the Irish Convent of St. Gall in Switzerland, was the author of proses in Mass.‡ Now considering the active communication kept up between St. Gall and Ireland we should be prepared to see the proses appear first in the Irish missals; but there is none in the *Corpus*, therefore we are to infer that the *Corpus* preceded in point of time Notker, who died in the year

* Vid. Thomassinus, "Traité des Fêtes," lib. ii. ch. xiii. "Traité des Jeunes," 2^{de} partie, ch. i.

† Durandus, *Rationale*, &c., lib. iv. chap. 22.

‡ Eckhard, *de cas. monast. S. Galli*, and Durandus: "Book of Lismore," fol. 117, R. I. A. *Ab C. S. Gal do rigned na seceis.*

VOL. V.—NO. II. [Third Series.]

912. Hence we are to infer that the *Corpus Missal* preceded the tenth century. Again, we find that the word "*Domnus*" is used for *Dominus*, in the *Missal*. Now, Mabillon* assures us that the use of *Domnus* was reintroduced in the eleventh century; and as it was not introduced in the tenth century, the *Missal's* date is not assignable to that century.

(2) The *Gloria in Excelsis* is omitted in the *Missal*, but the *Gloria*, &c., became general after the tenth century; therefore the *Corpus Missal* was not written after the tenth century.

(3) The prayer *Suscipe Sancte Trinitas* is not found in the *Missal*, but that prayer was known in the eleventh century, therefore the *Missal* was not written in the eleventh century. The same may be said of the prayer at the *Agnus Dei*. This prayer—"Hæc commixtio et consecratio"—is not found in the Carthusian *Missals*, therefore it and the *Corpus Missal* were not known in the eleventh century.

(4) In the *Missal* there is no notice of the *Creed*, which became general in the tenth century, therefore the *Missal* was written before the tenth century.

22. But if the *Corpus Missal* was not written so early as the tenth century, it must have been written after the eighth, and therefore in the ninth century. For the prayer at the end of Mass, "*Placeat*," was not generally used till the ninth century.†

So, too, the semicolon and comma did not come into common use till the ninth century; and they are commonly used in the *Missal*; therefore it was written after the eighth century.

Again, the psalm *Judica me* at beginning of Mass did not become general till after the eighth century; therefore, not being found in the *Missal*, we are to infer it was written in the ninth century.

23. But what puts beyond doubt the writing of the *Corpus* to have taken place after the eighth century is the Feast of All Saints. That festival was instituted by Gregory IV., whose pontificate lasted from the year 827 to 844.

In conclusion, I would say that while the historical notices in the *Corpus Missal* on which the editor has mainly relied are useless in determining its age, the liturgical evidence in it, on which he places so little stress, is abundantly sufficient to determine it. The historical notices, while insufficient to determine the true date, are very useful in disproving a false date of the *Missal*. Take, for instance, a petition in one of the Litanies: "*Deign to preserve that Lord, the King, and the army of Christians*," &c. This evidently supposes the presence of, and

* "*Museum Italic.*," vol. i. p. cxxiv.

† Menard, "*Sacrament. S. Greg.*"

danger from, an infidel army. Such a petition, while out of character in the twelfth century, was very natural and usual in the ninth century and beginning of the tenth century. Hence we meet in Missals of that date with such petitions as this: "Preserve, O Lord, the Emperor Otho and the army of Christians."*

In the ninth century, when Christendom was unformed, when the infidel was pressing in on the north and south, nothing was more natural than allusion to the *Army of Christians*. And though some parts of the Roman Empire were not brought in so direct contact with the infidel as other parts, yet it was the duty of the Mother of Churches, as the mouthpiece of all their necessities, to keep an eye on the infidel and express a special concern for the Christian army. This was the more natural and certain as Rome itself had had to entertain as Christian a fear of the infidel as had any king or Kesar.

This view of the matter is strikingly exemplified in the pontificate of Leo IV. Rome was threatened by the Saracens, and the Pope employed the riches of the Church in repairing the city walls, building towers, and throwing chains across the Tiber. He armed the militia, and engaged the inhabitants of Gaeta and Naples to defend the port of Ostia. The Pope himself was present, not as a warrior, but as a second Moses, encouraging and blessing the Christian army.† The result was a splendid victory for the Christians, and a signal defeat to the Saracens. The fortifications thrown up by the Pope are called to this day the "Leonine City," and the victory achieved has been immortalized by the painting of Raphael in the halls of the Vatican. This happened in the year 849. However, the Saracens renewed their encroachments by-and-by, and gave such trouble as to make it necessary for Pope John VIII. in a few years subsequently to purchase peace from them by a promise of an annual tribute.‡ A litany containing a prayer for the Christian army would not be out of place during any of the ninth century; but if I were to assign to one year rather than another in the first half of the ninth century the date of the Corpus Missal, that year would be 849. In hazarding a conjecture as to the precise time in which the Corpus Missal was written, I must be understood as speaking of the original. Considering the distance of Ireland from Rome in those days, some time may naturally be supposed to have elapsed between the writing of the original "Corpus Missal" and its Irish transcript.

* Missale in *Biblioth. di Fier. Naz.* xxxvi. 18.

† Volt. *Essai sur mœurs.*

‡ Fleury, "Hist. Ecclesiast." (new edition), iii. p. 501. Artaud's "Vie des Pont."

Some have traced a similarity between it and the characters of the "Book of Irish Hymns," written about the year 900. Nor is it unreasonable to suppose that a copy of the Missal was made as late as this date. But considering the uninterrupted and active communication kept up between Ireland and Rome, and the practical use to which the Missal was turned, it is highly unlikely that the Irish Copy was executed after the year 900. On that account, as well as for reasons already assigned, there are solid grounds for assigning the date of the Irish "Corpus Missal" to between the middle and the end of the ninth century.

SYLVESTER MALONE, M.R.I.A. & F.R.H.A.A.I.

ART. VI.—RITUALISM ESTIMATED FROM WITHIN AND WITHOUT.

1. *Anglican-Ritualism as seen by a Catholic and Foreigner.* A Series of Essays, with an Appendix on the Present State of the Church in France. By Abbé P. MARTIN, D.D., Licentiate of Canon Law, Professor of Holy Scripture in the Catholic Institute of Paris, and Honorary Canon of Cahors. London : Burns & Oates, 1881.
2. *The Church under Queen Elizabeth.* An Historical Sketch. With an Introduction on the Present Position of the Established Church. By Rev. F. G. LEE, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth. London : Allen & Co. Two vols. 1880.

BOTH these books treat more or less fully of that well-worn and all but exhausted subject, Ritualism ; and we feel that an apology is due to our readers for once more returning to an exploded phase of religion in England. It is true that we believe we can once more expose its hollowness as a system of thought ; the lack of any philosophical basis for its creed, or of any authority for its action ; and the sheer eclecticism of much that is most noteworthy in the conduct of its disciples. But then, again, we feel that this has all been proved by others so often, and so much better than we can hope to prove it, that if they made no impression on the victims of the delusion, why may we hope to make any ? You cannot force the truth on men's minds, if the men themselves are unwilling to receive it ; and we see reason to fear that both prejudice and party spirit now unite to prevent Ritualists from wishing calmly to estimate the probable truth or falsehood of their position.

Outsiders, again, can take but little interest in our present effort. Indeed, they may be tempted to compare it with that of a man who should at this date produce an elaborate scheme for showing the folly of the South Sea Bubble. However cleverly the problem might be worked out, few would be interested in its ingenuity. The folly of the speculation has been demonstrated so often that the only wonder now is, that any should once have been rash enough to put faith in it. We cannot help seeing a certain analogy between the financial and the religious bubble; both so promising at their outset, and both so disappointing in their result. But the process of collapse is slower in the case of the religious Will-o'-the-wisp than in that of the financial; for Ritualism, although it has ceased to interest the thinking and philosophical part of the nation, still attracts the foolish and exasperates the bigoted. Ritualism, therefore, is kept before us as a fact where it has vanished as a religious system, upon which it was possible to argue effectively and which serious-minded men were prepared to defend. Moreover, although slaying the dead may be an unwelcome task, still, if there be but a single soul who believes the dead to be alive, and clings to a corrupt body with the despairing hope that it may yet prove itself a living soul, and if there be any chance that a stray word may dispel the illusion, it is well that such a word should be spoken.

That the publication of Abbé Martin's "*Anglican-Ritualism*" should so shortly have followed that of Dr. Lee's "*History of the Church under Queen Elizabeth*" was fortunate; for the mental process of comparing one book with the other cannot fail to give occasion to much useful thought to members of the Establishment. In Dr. Lee's work we see a graphic picture of the triumphant seizure of all ecclesiastical and spiritual power by the Crown and State of England; and the uprooting of the Catholic Church from our country, with its doctrines, its orders, and its sacraments. In Abbé Martin's book we read an account, as it impresses a sympathetic and critical foreigner, of the uprising against State tyranny of a small fraction of the communion founded by Queen Elizabeth, a communion which for the last three centuries has lain, silent and quiescent, in the chains of her forging.

On turning from one book to the other we are tempted to rub our eyes, and ask if we are really awake. We feel, at any rate, that we understand all that Dr. Lee tells us. His history is no unique case. A proud and tyrannical sovereign rose in rebellion against God's Church, its head, its doctrines, and its discipline; and, by a persecution as cruel and relentless as that of any Roman emperor, succeeded in driving Catholics from their homes, severing priests from their flocks, and exiling bishops from their sees. For centuries Catholics lay hidden in holes and corners of the

land, not daring to own their creed, and practising their religion only at the peril of their lives; whilst those who had usurped their possessions and replaced their clergy as the religious teachers of England zealously fought against Catholic truth. All this is an old story; but when viewed anew, and in the light of what Abbé Martin tells us to-day, it is certainly a curious one, or rather the position of the men of whom he writes is a curious one.

He describes and criticizes a small and energetic body of Anglicans, who, either by study, by foreign travel, or by natural prepossession, suddenly find themselves disgusted with the Protestant present, and on the strength of their own authority determine to organize a Catholic future. We seem to hear them exclaim: "Now let's all be Catholics;" and, as they believe that to will and to be are the same thing, they proceed vehemently to denounce what exists, to extol what has vanished, and to labour heart and soul to restore what was lost.

This, of course, would be legitimate and praiseworthy work were it done on a legitimate and praiseworthy basis. Hundreds of Protestant ministers and thousands of Protestant laymen, in our day, have owned that the Reformation was the triumph of evil, have retraced the steps trodden for them by their ancestors, and have humbly returned to the fold from which, through no fault of their own, they found themselves outcasts. But so commonplace a way of "being Catholics" is far from the thoughts of those of whom Abbé Martin writes. This method, however effective, they denounce as treachery to their spiritual mother; and they loudly condemn, as apostates and traitors, all who become Catholics after the simple old-fashioned manner. Their aim is more ambitious; and individual conversion to the truth they object to, as interfering with this aim. A small body of Anglican clergy have decided what amount of Catholic teaching it is necessary to hold, in order to be raised to the brevet rank of "Catholic;" and as those whom they influence grasp one truth after another, so they rise in the Catholic scale till, from being "rather," they become "very," and at length "quite Catholic." Should the whole nation eventually embrace their teaching—a result more desired than expected, even by the sanguine—their object will have been accomplished; and although the English Church will still as a fact be a small and isolated body, energized by no divine and living spirit, she will yet in their eyes be "Catholic." Ritualists will be content with their work when England shall have embraced the whole sacramental system which is taught by the Church, and which their spiritual ancestors discarded at the Reformation. But, they seem unconscious of the fact that, were England as unanimous in accepting the true teaching touching the Seven Sacraments as she to-day is at one in rejecting it, she

would even then be no more Catholic than she is now. She would still be severed from the body of Christ; she would still be out of communion with its head; she would still have no part in the communion of saints; her orders would still be invalid; her jurisdiction would still be null and void.

Anglicans seem unconscious of the truth, that the Catholic Church is a reality as well as an idea; is a fact, and not alone a creed; and that it is by participating in and forming a portion of this entirety that we can alone become Catholic. Though, of course, revealed doctrine forms an important aspect of the Church, we must remember that she also embraces in her divine system Christian ethics, a form of government, the worship of God, orders and jurisdiction, discipline, &c., each in its turn of paramount importance to the whole; and that it is useless arbitrarily to select one aspect, and to imagine that, by submitting to this one point, we have accepted the whole system. Of this truth Dr. Lee, differing herein from the majority of Ritualists, seems to have some indistinct and faint idea. He makes an important concession when he admits that, until England is once more in union with and submissive to the Holy See, his work and that of his friends is incomplete; and we may readily grant that, were unity again restored (knowing well all that that word involves), England would once more assuredly be truly Catholic.

Dr. Lee, however, seems to have mastered this idea but partially, for he is able to look on what is, as a fact, the foundation of all truth and steadfastness in doctrine and morals as a kind of ornamental adjunct to the Anglican system, giving, indeed, a finish and completeness to the whole, but one which is not at all essential, and for which he can afford, and is even content, to wait patiently. Meanwhile, he will toil for the restoration of each isolated doctrine in detail; and when all are accepted by the Anglican body, he then hopes to crown his work by a corporate act of submission from the Established Church to our Lord's Vicar. But this, surely, is to reverse the natural order of things. Dr. Lee owns that the breach with Rome was the first act of the Reformation; and that the subsequent enormities, which he deplores apparently as much as we ourselves do, only followed as the inevitable result of this breach. But he curiously proceeds to argue, that as then it was the *first* act in the work of destruction of the sixteenth century, so now it must be the *last* act in the work of reconstruction of to-day. And he argues thus, whilst admitting the absolute necessity of this "crowning act of the Tractarian movement." The Pope's authority once discarded by England, he owns that all went wrong; but he ventures to expect a corporate revival of the true faith as a preliminary step towards, and not as a subsequent result of, the same authority being restored. This

argument we cannot but think is what is popularly known as "putting the cart before the horse." The power of the Holy See once defied—slowly or speedily as the case may be, but without doubt surely—all the ills of which Dr. Lee complains must inevitably follow. Equally certain is it, that all Catholic truth would be instantly restored, were England once more to make its submission to the Pope. This last assertion no one can dispute. Why, then, does Dr. Lee place the necessary act of submission last in the order of time? His own form of reasoning ought to show him, that the wearisome labour of building up one isolated truth after another upon an uncertain basis would be avoided, and the much longed-for result would at once be obtained, by placing the Anglican Church in communion with the Pope as a first instead of a concluding act in the Tractarian drama.

We argue with Dr. Lee, as if he intended us to take seriously all that he writes in the Introduction to his "History of the Church under Queen Elizabeth." But we own that we have sometimes had our doubts. We have seldom read anything more remarkable than this volume, when we consider that its author is a beneficed clergyman of the Establishment. Till now, we have felt that in argument with members of the Church of England we knew pretty well where we stood. No doubt the Ritualist party often shift their ground, and we are not always sure where we shall next find them; but with Dr. Lee we feel almost as if the tables were turned upon us. We would fain ask, in what character does he expose the Erastianism of the Establishment, and ridicule its articles, and pour scorn on its authorities? If as a Catholic, or, to be plainer still to Anglican ears, we will say a Roman Catholic, we can only agree with him. But then, what are we to say to the Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth? Is the oft-repeated calumny true after all? and to-day, all disguise being thrown off, may Anglican parsons boldly avow themselves in league with the Pope? Will Dr. Lee tell us frankly, if he believes any true difference to exist between a Roman Catholic and an Anglican? His Introduction, taken as a whole, might have been written by a Catholic, and yet its author is an Anglican clergyman. If we can agree with Dr. Lee's estimate, not only of the Reformation, but of the present position and status of the communion of which he is a member, can such an estimate be really that of one who is loyal and true to his Church, its orders and its sacraments?

We have no wish to insinuate a charge of dishonesty against Dr. Lee. The accusation, indeed, would be meaningless from our lips, for we do not pretend to understand the point where legitimate differences between members of the Establishment end, and where disloyalty begins. The boasted comprehensive-

ness of the Anglican Church appears to us to be nothing more than a criminal laxity, which allows those who affirm and those who deny the same doctrine an equal share in the good things which she has to bestow upon them all. But even to this laxity we believe there is a limit, beyond which many persons may think that Dr. Lee steps, when he pleads for the restoration of the Papal supremacy in England.

The above remarks apply mainly to the Introduction to Dr. Lee's work, and it is there that his own views are mainly set forth. In the body of the book, although his own mental bias is evident, still he deals with historical facts, which he uses chiefly to show the secular and Erastian origin of the Church of England, and the cruel and drastic persecutions by which it was forced on an unwilling people. Here again, we fail to comprehend Dr. Lee's position. Were a Broad Churchman to prove, as he does, that the origin of the Establishment was secular, to demonstrate as unfailingly the way in which the Church accepted the subordinate position assigned her and how willingly she now hugs her chains—we need feel no wonder. The Broad Church party is believed to aspire to nothing higher than to be one aspect of the State. It believes that position to be the one most in accordance with the Christian ideal of a Church; and we have no intention here of combatting that view. However curious we may think it that Christians should thus believe, a Broad Churchman would be in no way inconsistent in writing such a book as the one before us. But with Dr. Lee it is different. He knows and asserts, that if a certain set of facts be true, the Church of which he is a member and teacher is no Church at all. He knows that if she has no valid orders, she has no valid sacraments; and that where there are no valid sacraments, there can be no certainty of salvation. He knows that being in communion with the See of Peter is essential, and that without true jurisdiction the administration of some sacraments is impossible. All this he knows, and he loudly proclaims his knowledge. He then deliberately proceeds to show that the facts are true, that the orders are doubtful, and that there is no jurisdiction; but yet he leads us to infer that for some inscrutable reason it is still the duty of English men and women to risk their souls for that which is a mere creation of a dissolute and unscrupulous sovereign. Moreover, he holds that they may still receive some sacraments, not knowing whether they are a reality or a sham, and that they must dispense with others, as without jurisdiction they cannot be had. This we assert to be Dr. Lee's teaching, for he proves over and over again the secular origin of the Establishment, quotes without disapproval authorities who disallow her orders, maintains the necessity of union with the Holy See—and yet,

never advises its members to leave an heretical and Erastian body, which, considered as a Church, he must affirm to be a colossal and unmitigated imposture.

To Catholics, the history of the Elizabethan persecutions and the true nature of the Church of England are well known. Yet, Dr. Lee's book gives us much matter for thought, as it ought assuredly to give some grounds for action to all his co-religionists, who believe that a Church is something more than a mere civil department of the State. We will extract, almost at random, a few criticisms quoted by Dr. Lee which ought certainly to have a disquieting effect on logical Anglicans. The assertions can hardly be gainsaid, and the inferences which follow naturally from the facts are important. Speaking of the Anglican Church law courts, Archdeacon Palmer (in his Charge, A.D. 1879) writes :—

The cardinal fact is that the final determination of all ecclesiastical causes is vested in the Crown, and is confided to a court which the Crown has established with the consent of Parliament, and of Parliament alone, and that all other courts ecclesiastical are bound to echo its decisions. This, as I have reminded you (the Archdeacon is speaking to his clergy), has been the law and use of England for nearly three centuries and a half, if we neglect the short reign of Philip and Mary. It has been, in principle, more than once formally recognized, never formally repudiated, by the synods of the Church of England. . . . Our Church, as I have said already, has more than once synodically affirmed the supreme jurisdiction of the Crown in causes ecclesiastical; she has never synodically rejected it.

If this be so, it is surely now somewhat out of date to protest against the latest development of a principle which for 350 years has been accepted; and the following words from Mr. Wagner, of St. Paul's, Brighton (in his "Christ or Cæsar," part ii. p. 40, 1877), are meaningless from one who, so far as he is an English Churchman, is bound to, and compromised by, the Tudor settlement :—

Not one single bishop of the Province of Canterbury has, as yet, *publicly* protested against a claim which, if granted, would wholly efface the spiritual authority of a "bishop in the Church of God."

According to Archdeacon Palmer, the claim was advanced; and therefore the "spiritual authority" was effaced a very long time ago, which is the very point Catholics have always maintained, but which at this date seems a new idea to the Ritualists. Turning to an honoured correspondent of the High Church organ, the *Guardian* (in the number for Sept. 10th, 1879), Mr. F. H. Dickenson, we read that :—

Any one who has watched the Church of England during the past

forty years must see that our faith and doctrine have largely altered; and there is no reason to think that alteration has ceased.

And again, Dr. Lee himself says :—

The one Church of God is alone divine, all local and national churches being essentially human.

Ought Ritualists to remain quietly and patiently in a communion of which such statements can truly be made?

We can anticipate their answer. They will tell us that they have no intention of remaining either quiet or patient; but that they intend to work and agitate until the facts of the Establishment correspond better with their ideal of a Church; until they have reformed and transformed a Protestant and local sect into a Catholic Church. Here, however, we may retort, that merely to entertain such a hope is fresh evidence, where none was needed, that the Ritualistic party have not yet grasped even the elementary idea of a Church, in the Catholic meaning of the word. They use it in a different sense to that which it bears to Catholic ears; and this difference is sufficiently important to merit a few remarks.

We fear that even a High Churchman is powerless to master the truth contained in the article of the Creed, "I believe in the Catholic Church." He will tell us, that he believes in the Catholic Church; but we have only to test his belief by a question, and we soon discover that his meaning is, "I believe in the *doctrines* of the Catholic Church," which is a very different thing. He reads the teaching of antiquity and the Holy Scriptures by the light of his own private judgment; and, agreeing with all that he reads, he considers himself a Catholic. He is conscious that the communion to which he belongs has strayed far from this teaching; so he sets to work (sadly hampered, indeed, by the formularies to which he has bound himself) to bring back a selected portion of Catholic doctrine into his own teaching. His selection is somewhat arbitrary; and his position of instructor to his own Church is entirely anomalous. But, he aspires to no more than to bring all whom he can influence into agreement with himself. He has no idea that, to Catholics, a scheme for reforming the Church would be as meaningless as one for reforming the Bible; and that a plan for restoring "Church teaching" would be a simple absurdity. Of the true belief in the Church as a living and a teaching body, energized by God the Holy Ghost, the High Churchman is not only himself devoid, but he seems incapable of understanding us Catholics, when we tell him of our faith in the Church. The remarks which were made on the unanimous submission of the small minority of Bishops at the Vatican Council to its ultimate definitions, were evidence of the inability

of the average Anglican to realize the force of a true spiritual power—a power which forces us willingly to bow our judgment to that of the Church when she distinctly defines a matter of faith or morals. It is difficult, no doubt, for an Anglican to think of a Church; otherwise than as an organized society which teaches the truth; and the more truth this organization teaches, the nearer to his ideal of a Church does it approach. As to what is the truth, in the case of many individual doctrines, a High Churchman agrees with the Church, and not with the Reformers who are responsible for the present doctrinal basis of the Establishment. But granted he was one with the Church in every Catholic doctrine, there would yet remain the all-important fact, that he did not believe in the Church as a Church; but that he believed in the doctrines not simply and solely because the Church taught them, but because from other sources he had reason to think that they were true. Indeed, we have cause to suspect that some Anglicans go further. We suspect that some are even received into the Church because they find her teaching identical with that which they believe to be true; instead of reversing the order of the argument, and believing in the Church first, and then accepting the truth because she teaches it. Although, once safely within the fold and enjoying the means of grace there alone to be found, a true faith may succeed a true opinion, yet we believe that the few cases of melancholy relapse into heresy and schism which we occasionally witness may often be due to the fact, that the apostate had thus reversed the manner of receiving the truth. These unsatisfactory converts are not so much renegades, as men who have never been Catholics. They called themselves Catholics, it is true; and others believed them to be Catholics; and they may not necessarily have been in bad faith. They were merely ignorant of the essential meaning of the word. They might even argue (so difficult is it to eradicate the peculiarly English idea of believing in doctrines, rather than in the authority which imposes them) that when they were received into the Church—say in 1850—they were Catholics; but that they never meant to believe in the Immaculate Conception nor in Papal Infallibility, and that it was the Church that had changed and not they. But such a line of argument only proves that such persons had never believed in the teaching power of the Church, and were simply unfit subjects for reception into the fold. No one can be a Catholic but he who believes in the ever-living power of God's Church to teach and to define. He must believe not alone in what she taught yesterday, but also in what she teaches to-day, and in what she will teach to-morrow. This is the meaning of being a Catholic; and it is a mere contradiction of terms to call a man a Catholic, and then allow him to

doubt, even on one point, the Church's teaching. If the Church's voice be God's voice, every word that she utters is equally true with every other word; and if you cannot believe that her voice is God's voice, then you simply are not a Catholic.

That Anglicans never believe in the teaching power of the Established Church is evident; and the peculiar history of their formularies makes it impossible for them to place any confidence in this aspect of the ecclesiastical body to which they belong. The changes alone which have avowedly taken place from truth to heresy, and back again (as they believe) to truth, are the cause of the impossibility. We have ourselves been told by a very advanced High Churchman that, at one period of its history, what is known to Anglicans as the "black rubric" in their Communion Office was distinctly heretical; but that now, thank God, although its still halting and hesitating language was liable to be misunderstood, he could accept it as orthodox. The clergyman in question evidently did not realize that, by such a frank admission, he upset his hearer's, if not his own, confidence in the teaching power of the Church of England. Never rising to a belief in the Church because she was the Church, he thought that all was well if at present the Anglican Church were orthodox. He did not realize that if once, no matter for how short a time, her formularies were teaching a lie, she could never again be confided in as God's Church. Can the Holy Ghost speak with faltering lips? Can He utter falsehood to-day, and to-morrow correct Himself?

Dr. Lee tells us that the Establishment is a "community founded on the principle of reform (and) is of course ever liable to reform." The Church of God, on the contrary, was founded by our Divine Lord, and lives by the breath of His Holy Spirit; and he must be a bold man who dares mention the word "reform" in connection with His revealed scheme for the guidance of the world. A bitter Ritualistic opponent of the Church has given as one reason for his remaining in the Anglican communion, that were he a Catholic he would not be allowed to attempt the "reform" of the Church; whilst he hopes by remaining where he is to "reform" the Establishment from heresy into orthodoxy. If such are to be his hopes in joining the Church he is wise to refrain. Indeed, let him wish it as sincerely as he may, with such views it would be impossible for him to be a Catholic. Until he realizes that he must *submit* to the Catholic Church; and that God's work requires no "reforming," nor indeed is capable of being "reformed" by man, he had far better remain in the "community founded on the principle of reform."

Dr. Lee's history is deeply interesting, and may be found useful

by Catholics in controversy with ordinary Protestants as affording evidence from the hostile camp, and from an office-bearer in that camp, of the truth of much that we have always maintained. Yet, we turn with relief from the uncertain ground of Catholic and historical truth taught by a Protestant, and therefore an inconsistent person, to Abbé Martin's straightforward account of a foreigner's impression of the Ritualistic movement. Here at least we know where we are; and, after wandering in the fog in which Dr. Lee leaves us, we feel as if we once more stood in open daylight, and need fear no ambush, nor distrust the plain evidence of our senses.

Although in the main agreeing with Abbé Martin's estimate of Ritualism, we believe that he attaches more importance to the movement than it deserves. He seems somewhat to exaggerate its extent and influence, and to be unaware of the considerable effect which the Public Worship Regulation Act has had in a three-fold direction. It has lessened the number of churches in which (to use the somewhat ill-natured but expressive words of a prominent statesman) "Mass in masquerade" is performed. It has diminished the details of such masquerading in churches where the imitation of Catholic worship has been maintained. And it has localized the imitation and prevented it from spreading. Such exaggeration, however, is easily explained: in the first place by the fact that Ritualism is much more quietly snuffed out in the majority of cases than it is introduced; and secondly, from the authorities which Abbé Martin quotes, we believe that he must carefully study a portion of the lower and least reputable class of the English Church press, than which it would be difficult to find a more untrustworthy guide to truth. Ambiguous, if not false statements in the case of crushing defeats from the field of battle are common; but many of the despatches in these journals, where a specially severe legal catastrophe is usually described as a "complete success all along the line," are even less to be relied on. The tone of "never say die" with which disasters are met may, indeed, denote a high spirit; but it is hardly a practical one when applied to a body already dead; utterly dead as to principle; and fast dying as a consistent fact.

The Abbé Martin's mistake, therefore, touching the extent of Ritualism, is easily understood. It is difficult, even for an Englishman, whilst living in the midst of the din and strife of parties to realize the extent and power of the different religious schools. But for a foreigner, who cannot easily understand what it is that most deeply arouses popular fury, and makes the object of it suddenly notorious, it is only not impossible to estimate their respective numbers, influence, and strength. If but one church, with a thousand sympathizers, had done as much as

St. Albans' Church, Holborn, did some fifteen years ago—namely, suddenly metamorphose the quiet Anglican communion office into a grand ceremonial service, with nearly every accessory of High Mass, candles, vestments, and incense, in external ritual, and with *Confiteor*, *Agnus Dei*, and Last Gospel from the Missal added liturgically—would not the spectacle naturally cause observation and alarm, quite out of proportion to its intrinsic importance? The ninety-nine righteous clergymen naturally escape notice, whilst public attention is exclusively centred on the hundredth who is the exception. Supposing even a single company of one regiment of our army were to change its uniform, drill, and regulations, and, although all the superior authorities should declare such conduct mutinous, were still to maintain that they alone understood military law and Horse Guard regulations, and to hold on to their position in the army in spite of courts martial and universal condemnation—would not such a spectacle be more noteworthy and cause more sensation than the regular and obedient behaviour of the rest of our forces? The two cases are somewhat analogous. The fact of a beneficed clergyman defying his bishop, ignoring every legal decision, and finally spending some weeks in prison, is luckily so rare as to be what we may call a noisy fact, making more stir than in itself it is worth. When, too, we consider that the novelties introduced into the English services are close imitations of the one religion the mere existence of which John Bull resents, we need not wonder that the opposition which Ritualism has aroused is out of all proportion to its importance. The average Briton, who is no close reasoner, sees a function which he can hardly distinguish from a Catholic Mass; perhaps he studies the books which are used by Ritualists,* where he discovers much or nearly all in the Missal that was rejected by the Reformers carefully dovetailed back into the Book of Common Prayer; and he certainly knows that many thousands who once used these or similar books, and who either performed or assisted at these services, now swell the ranks of the detested faith. In the face of these facts, is it surprising, we ask, that he vehemently and loudly denounces the foe he has discovered in his own household?

We believe that Ritualism is more important when viewed in relation to the opposition it has aroused, and in the effects of this opposition, than in any other aspect. What Ritualists assert to be, though they are not, radical changes in the constitution of the English Church, have been made in order to ease the work of its suppression. Anglican bishops have sacrificed whatever jurisdiction remained to them; and have handed over to

* "The Priest to the Altar," and "The Ritual of the Altar."

a layman what they originally received from the Crown. Any shadow of spiritual power, therefore, which may have been left to the Establishment has now vanished, equally with the substance which Dr. Lee proves to have been already destroyed by Queen Elizabeth. It is in vain that, now the work is done, Ritualists expostulate, protest, and are imprisoned. They do all they can to affirm that they are in no way concerned, or compromised, by the results of the Public Worship Regulation Act; but the fact remains, that it was they and they alone who provoked it; that their bishops proposed it; and that the immense majority of their co-religionists acquiesce in it. It is but one more example of the danger of setting a ball rolling when we are powerless to direct its course. Had High Churchmen, or rather, we ought to say, had extreme Ritualists, for we are conscious of the difference between the two, been well advised they would have refrained from daring the English nation with the startling innovations which were introduced some years ago. For a small and unpopular minority to exasperate the majority, is as foolish as the conduct of a man would be, who, shut up alone with an angry bull, should further enrage him by waving a red flag in his face. His one object ought to be, to escape the animal's notice. If the Ritualists realized the temper of Protestant England, they ought to have avoided arousing it into activity. Whilst you hold your opinions quietly, none are concerned to deny them; but once flaunt them in the face of the public, and they are either accepted or means are taken to prevent you from spreading them. We are not, be it understood, defending those who are silent, because if they spoke, an authority which they ought to respect would suppress them. The whole position of Ritualists, granting that they are honest men, is one which it is impossible for an outsider to comprehend. But, arguing as best we can from their position, we think it was either ignorance or folly which could have induced them to cast the die, "to win or lose it all." They ought to have known that, in the then temper of the people, they could not win. They might have anticipated defeat, though its crushing nature may legitimately have surprised them; for that Anglican bishops should themselves help still further to secularize their Church was a remarkable and unexpected phenomenon.

The scandal of the complete secularizing of the Anglican Ecclesiastical law courts has had, in the eyes of Ritualists, one counterbalancing advantage: they consider that it has absolved them from the duty of obeying any authority whatsoever. Bishop's requests and Crown mandates, judgments in the Court of Arches, or orders from the Privy Council, they only now discover, come to them tainted by the secular touch of Parliament, and are therefore to be treated as so much waste paper. To men

in their present temper, the delights of conscientious disobedience are considerable; and that no spiritual authority worthy of their respect should exist is a matter of congratulation. This does not, of course, apply to high-minded men like Dr. Liddon. He has frankly told us what authority would bind his conscience; and that were such an authority to be created and to decide after a manner which he could not accept, he should know where he was, and that the Establishment was no place for him. But from Ritualists his proposal has met with nothing but contempt. He is ridiculed as childishly unsuspicious and absurdly innocent, in avowing a willingness to forge powers which will only be wielded against himself. The real temper of the party is, we fear, more truly depicted in a letter in the acknowledged organ of the Ritualists, where we read:

I trust we shall in no way attempt to help the authors of the Public Worship Regulation Act out of their scrape; and especially that we shall abstain from pledging ourselves to accept the decisions on questions of doctrine or ceremonial of bishops, convocations, or courts spiritual. . . . Till disruption shall separate the Church Catholic from the Establishment, we are best with courts *which we can conscientiously disobey*. (*Church Times* of January 29th. The italics are our own).

The intense dislike which Ritualists feel for the virtue of obedience extends even beyond themselves. They object that others (with whom they assuredly have no need to concern themselves) should loyally and cheerfully obey their bishops. Cardinal Bonnechose's simple, though, to Catholic ears, satisfactory, words: "My clergy is a regiment; when I say 'March,' it marches," were met by an outcry; and even at this date are repeated with scorn and derision by Ritualists. Would the truth as spoken by an Anglican bishop be more consistent with the primitive teaching to which they are fond of appealing? "My clergy is a very ill-disciplined regiment; indeed, I would not insult the army by comparing it with one. When I say 'March,' a few advance, some go back, many halt, most argue, and all abuse me." If ready obedience gives so much offence, can the system of each of the clergy taking his own line be considered more satisfactory?

Considering the harm arising from the constant conflict of parties in the Establishment, and the absolute waste of time, temper, and money which they cause, we should sincerely welcome the advent of a modern Elijah, who, were he to thunder forth the much-needed question: "Why halt ye between two opinions," might hope to bring the disputants to abide by some definite issue. Some years ago, we hoped much from the law courts, for the English Church Union definitely stated that their decisions would be final to those whom it represented. But,

from subsequent events, we fear these promising words only meant that should the law be found favourable to their views and practices, it would meet with all respect from Ritualists; for each fresh legal decision has only been a fresh departure into disorder and chaos. It is well for a Broad Churchman that Anglican principles should be vague and undetermined; uncertainty being the atmosphere in which he breathes most freely. But for the party of dogma, it is surely essential that the body to which they belong should speak with unfaltering lips.

We believe, however, that the High Church disputants would never venture to ascend Mount Carmel with those from whom they differ. Elijah would entreat in vain; for they have no strong faith that it would be their sacrifice, and not that of their hated rival, which would be consumed by fire from Heaven. They are secretly afraid to face facts, to go to the root of the matter, and let the body to which they belong settle, once for all, what is right and who is wrong. Indeed, on no side can they turn with trusting assurance. A High Churchman is afraid frankly to ask his Church clearly to define her teaching; for he has no confidence but that she may define heresy. He is afraid to face history; for it tells him that his Church is the creation of a secular sovereign. He is afraid to face his Prayer-Book; for it is silent on much that he cherishes as important. He is afraid to face Convocation; for it would condemn him: or his bishop; for he must either disobey him, or cease to be what he is. And lastly, he is afraid to face antiquity; for there the man whom he once was proud to follow and still reveres found that which he little went to seek, perhaps little hoped to find; found one grand solid fact—one fact which, let him turn to the right or let him turn to the left, still met him; one fact which the more persistently he tried to ignore it the more certainly was it ever present—the Rock of Peter founded by our Lord.

The dread of some day having to face this fact can never be wholly absent from a Ritualist's mind. The great man who originated the party has led the way to a very certain goal; and many Anglicans, we are convinced, are afraid fairly to face their position, lest they should be compelled to follow him. They dare not pause to *think*; but turn, as a relief, to active work in degraded towns, or even to trumpery suits in law courts which divert the mind from the main question.

We, who can afford to accept the simple straightforward teaching of our religion, who fear to investigate nothing, for the fuller our knowledge the more consistently, with Divine consistency, does the Church's teaching shine above the wrangling of sects and the divisions of parties—we must curb any

impatience we may be tempted to feel at the spectacle of those men, who seem ever approaching the truth, yet never embrace it. We must endeavour to realize the force of early prepossessions, and the difficulty of disregarding the prejudices of childhood; for these prevent many Englishmen from carrying the reasoning and logic which have led them to accept a portion of the teaching of the Church, to the natural conclusion of accepting the whole. The corruption of the Catholic Church and the purity of the Anglican Church were, fifty years ago, evident to the most ignorant of Englishmen; so evident, as to put the question outside practical argument. Life is not long enough to prove the falsity of every possible system. In discussion, it is necessary that the disputants should start from some common ground; and this ground the various parties in the Establishment found in the belief that, whatever else might be true, the Catholic Church was false. We are, therefore, now dealing with men whose education has given a twist to their intelligence, and has moulded their mind into a form in which a change alone could be effected by a more disinterested love of truth and a greater energy in embracing it than all men possess. If they see that a line of argument would lead to the Church, even though they can detect no fault in it, they suspect that somewhere it must be defective. The one fact of which their education has assured them, the one falsehood which they imbibed with their mother's milk, is that the Church of Rome is untrustworthy. If, therefore, in disputes with their co-religionists a theory can be shown to point to Rome, it must either be abandoned, or, what more usually happens, its logical conclusions must be defied. This may be one explanation of the many inconsistencies and the shiftings of their position to which we see Ritualists continually reduced. Logic *may* be faulty, but Rome *must* be wrong. Therefore, when it leads to Rome logic is sacrificed.

A small obstacle, if placed sufficiently near the eye, will obscure the full splendour of the mid-day sun; and an early prejudice, false in its teaching and contemptible in its origin, may prevent the truth from being allowed fair play. It is true that Abbé Martin recognizes the power of the "great Protestant tradition," and admits that it keeps many Anglicans in their untenable position, but we believe this influence to be even greater than any foreigner can realize. The want of logic in their teaching and the absence of consistency in their actions are mainly responsible for the irritation which all outside the party feel with the Ritualists. If, however, they mean to remain in the Establishment, it is as much their misfortune as their fault that they cannot face the logic of facts.

This would simply destroy the party, which would then be driven either to "return into its house," its state seven times worse than when it went forth; or it must be reconciled, in the one true fold, to our Lord's representative. In either case, this offshoot of the High Church school would cease to exist, as the nobler and more intelligent Tractarian party itself practically ceased to exist thirty years ago. If logical, the action of the Ritualists must be suicidal.

Abbé Martin seems to think that the Ritualistic party may eventually be strong enough to destroy the Establishment: that, Samson-like, it will bring the whole fabric of the Anglican body about its ears. He distinguishes between the Church and the Establishment in a manner which we believe Cardinal Newman has already shown to be impossible; and he thinks that, even yet, the *Church* may be strong enough to bring the *Establishment* to "Canossa." We fail to see this possibility, because we fail to see any "Canossa" in the most distant future. We fail to see it in the past (since England cut herself adrift from Rome), and we fail to-day to see the embryo of any power which might in the future be developed into a spiritual fortress. To create a *quasi*-Canossa is, we suppose, possible for a sect, but hardly on a Catholic basis. For here our Lord has been beforehand with His children, and eighteen hundred years ago founded and energized with His eternal spiritual power the Rock which hurled itself so effectively against the greatest temporal power of its day, the proud German Empire of the Middle Ages. But where in England do we see the germ of any power which could be used, and win the day against the State? A flock must be led by a shepherd; and it is the cry of all Anglicans that it is by their shepherds that they are most deeply betrayed. No: we have but to turn from Abbé Martin to Dr. Lee to see that a victory after the type of Canossa is impossible. Water cannot rise above its source; nor can a religion born in and nurtured by Erastianism be subsequently developed, merely by the zeal and good faith of its members, into a spiritual body. As we sow, so must we reap. The Church of England accepted the subordinate position assigned her three hundred years ago by Queen Elizabeth. Nor has she ever raised a protest against it. Convocation has of late years met freely; and Anglican synods can make their voice heard on matters touching which they feel teaching or reproof to be needed. But when the cardinal fact of all—the royal supremacy—is broached, we listen in vain for protest or remonstrance. In supposing, then, that Ritualism will ever be strong enough to destroy the Establishment, we see a further instance of the amiable manner in which Abbé Martin exaggerates the importance of the sect of which he writes. All must own that never was religious controversy more courteously conducted

than in this volume; and the Abbé refrains even from hinting at the fact, which though painful to those concerned, is nevertheless true, that, except as a disturbing influence, Ritualism is not less nationally than ecclesiastically insignificant.

Beside the changes in the legal aspect of the Establishment which it has brought about, we see another indirect influence of Ritualism in the perhaps unintentional impetus which it has given to Rationalism. We now find one stronghold of the Latitudinarian principle—namely, that dogma is unimportant—in the midst of the party of authority, of that High Church party which sprung into fresh life fifty years ago, for the express purpose of fighting Liberalism. We do not here allude to the melancholy fact which Cardinal Newman tells us distressed him so much. We are not now thinking of those who had followed him through his early reasoning and were Anglicans, but who, when their leader discovered that he had but been building on the sand, drew back, and, refusing to follow him to the house founded on a rock, joined the Liberal camp. Nor again, do we wish here to draw attention to those of whom Mr. Froude has lately written: the men who were set *thinking* by the Tractarian movement. Amongst these were many in whom all traditional belief was uprooted as a result of such thought; and, paradoxical as it may sound, Cardinal Newman's influence affected as powerfully those who in the event became sceptics as those who became Catholics. He showed that there were two, and only two, logical lines of thought, the reasoning which led to Rome, and the reasoning which led to the denial of all revelation; and those who refused to accept the first were, if consistent men, of necessity driven to accept the second alternative.

It is not, however, in deep thinkers who may deny all religion, or in philosophers who question all faith, that we to-day see the most noteworthy, if the less respectable, advocates of differences in belief, and of the unimportance of unity in doctrine. You can now rarely take up a Ritualistic organ without being struck by—to use an expressive idiom—the “give and take” tone of its arguments. The party that once fought for the true doctrine of Baptism and for the inspiration of Holy Scripture, are now content to remain in union with those who deny both. Indeed, they absolutely boast of the diversity of opinion allowable in their communion, and endeavour to prove that there are great advantages in belonging to a body which can find room within its fold for High, Low, and Broad Churchmen. High Churchmen, in virtue of their newly-developed Liberalism, will even admit that from both the other Anglican schools of thought they may learn much; in other words, that from those who end by disbelieving in all sacramental grace and from those who end by

denying the Incarnation, the men who confess both truths may profitably be instructed. It will not avail to argue that these differences are merely various views of the same doctrine, the two sides of one shield; for they are too great. The assertion and the denial of the same fact can hardly be looked on as a trifling divergence of opinion. If a High Churchman's teaching is right, then that of a Low Churchman must be wrong; and we fail to see that truth can profitably learn from falsehood. The plea for mutual toleration now advanced by High Churchmen would, if freely granted, merely assist the third party in the Establishment—the party which holds that dogma is unimportant and that absolute truth has not been revealed to us; the party which is ready to defend every form of belief or of unbelief so long as the Establishment is maintained. Indeed, the way in which Anglicans have lately played into the hands of Broad Churchmen has already met with a measure of reward in the sympathy bestowed on the former by a portion of the Liberal press. Whether such sympathy from the organ which advocated the opinions of Colenso and of "Essays and Reviews," and which frankly tells us that were either Low or Broad Church parties ever reduced to the straits in which the High Church party now finds itself placed it would warmly advocate their cause; whether sympathy on such terms ought to be entirely satisfactory to staunch advocates of dogma and authority, we leave others to determine.

We fear there is some truth in the assertion, that a small but determined body of men care more for their own individual crochets, than they care for the truth. They care more for the liberty to do as they like, than they care that heresy should be curbed; and their only chance of obtaining this liberty is in a law of toleration applied all round. If they are allowed to wear a vestment, they must condone in others the denial of miracles or the evasion of the Athanasian Creed. If they are allowed to "celebrate High Mass," they must abide contentedly in communion with the clergyman who thinks and preaches that it is an "anachronism" to attach vital importance to the doctrine of the Incarnation. Instead of advanced High Churchmen being ready to fight to the death for the small remnant of faith which is left them, they will barter it away for that miserable mess of pottage, the liberty to have an effective and ornate ceremonial. In return for external beauty in their Communion Service, they make it their boast that they have no wish to interfere with those who deny the elementary and cardinal doctrines of Christianity. Can any conduct be more truly Latitudinarian, however indignantly those concerned may reject the word? They are no longer anxious to fight error; all they ask is, that they may be let alone. For this gain they will now agree to leave others unmo-

tested. Liberalism could hardly have won a more significant victory than thus to see its chief enemy in the Establishment change his front. Is it too much to assert that in principle the difference between Rationalism and Ritualism has now vanished? Although as to degree the difference may still be great, it is now a mere question of degree and no longer one of kind.

Besides the Ritualistic opponents whom Abbé Martin successfully discomfits, he is attacked by another Protestant controversialist; by a man of an altogether different calibre to those who are convulsing the Establishment for the externals of worship. Mr. Gladstone, unfortunately, seems to have thought that the additional time, which some years ago he told us he was about to devote to religion, would be well spent in attacking God's Church. And he took occasion to continue his adverse criticism of the truth in connection with some of Abbé Martin's writings.

It is only the old cry that Mr. Gladstone raises against the Church, and which Abbé Martin once more proves to be a condition of all revealed religion whatsoever; the true but hackneyed assertion that Catholicism, being a religion of authority, is incompatible with liberty of thought. Although we admit that in the Church alone is authority exercised after a logical and consistent fashion, we may confidently ask Mr. Gladstone to point to any phase of the Christian religion which is founded on free thought. He tells us: "The spirit of the Christian religion such as he (Mr. Gladstone) professes it, is undoubtedly a spirit of examination." If Mr. Gladstone really means what he says, we can only answer that, in that case, his religion has little in common with the faith as revealed by our Lord and preached by his Apostles. Does Mr. Gladstone really wish us to think that he *examined* the different articles of the Creed before he believed them? that he *examined* the mysteries of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation before he accepted them? or even, that he thinks these dogmas fit topics for "examination?" Although all Catholics must differ radically from Mr. Gladstone, and must deeply resent his passionate and unjust attack on the Church; yet we do not think so ill of him as to believe that he intends us so to understand him. We believe that he, like all sincere Anglicans, has a real faith in the cardinal mysteries of Christianity; for, as we have said, many an Anglican can rise to the level of the true faith in individual doctrines, though he accepts them on a false principle, and fails to have a true faith in the Church that imposes them. In point of fact, however, we cannot, at the same time, both believe and examine. By a law of human nature, the state of mind which the

two words denote, cannot co-exist and be exercised by us touching the same subject and at the same time. They are self-contradictory. Does Mr. Gladstone mean, that whilst devotionally he is adoring the Holy Trinity he is intellectually examining the truth as to the existence of God? We feel confident that he would start from so blasphemous a suggestion with horror equal to our own. Yet, he finds fault with Catholics for not venturing to examine doctrines which to them are of equal importance. We will take one example—and it shall be the doctrine touching which the Catholic Church differs most deeply from Anglicanism, yet one which enters more closely into our daily devotional life than any other point of difference—namely, our Eucharistic doctrine. We suppose the “spirit of examination” would lead us to argue somewhat as follows: “I must examine this doctrine of the Mass before I can believe it; yet, I cannot sacrifice all my religion for this end. In the morning, therefore, I will adore my God present on the altar; and during the day it shall be my study to examine if He really were present. I will receive Him with devotion in communion at Church; and then, in my study, I will settle whether or not I believe that He truly gave Himself to me. When I have carefully compared St. Thomas with the Fathers, and seen the Mass of to-day side by side with the primitive Liturgies, I shall decide what is to be the permanent temper of my mind, whether I have been misled by a ‘blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit,’ or whether I may allow my devotion to flow on in the current in which it has ever flowed.” Stated thus, does not Mr. Gladstone’s principle of “examination” reduce both the spirit of religion and the spirit of inquiry to an absurdity?

Let Mr. Gladstone grant us but one doctrine which we must reverence, and he at once destroys his own case. The question between us then, as Abbé Martin says, becomes only one of degree. If he allows us to have faith in any revelation at all, then we, with every human being, whether Catholic or Protestant, must answer, that where we believe we cannot examine. Examination presupposes doubt; and faith and doubt cannot co-exist together, they are mutually destructive in intelligences constituted as ours are constituted. When, then, he complains that we Catholics do not examine, he really complains of Almighty God, who has so created us that we cannot believe in Him as He would have us believe; and yet, examine our religion critically as Mr. Gladstone would have us examine. His objection, though consistent with Rationalism, is meaningless from one who is prepared to take any revealed doctrine at all on faith.

We willingly admit that a great number of doctrines which Protestants consider fit subjects for examination, are in the Church

matters of faith ; but such narrowing of the subjects, concerning which doubt is admissible, is a mere matter of detail. The Church's principle is distinct and definite. She draws out her complete scheme for the true faith and salvation of her children, and slowly, yet surely, decides the truth concerning all the fresh difficulties and questions which, in the ever active working of the human mind, are sure in the course of ages to arise. Of her teaching, Anglicans, after a somewhat arbitrary manner, select a portion, and the rest they either denounce, or consider as a fit subject for differences amongst themselves. The results of this manner of manufacturing theology are sometimes remarkable ; to take but one example, in the English Church we see the belief in the tremendous mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation forced on her members on pain of "perishing everlastingly," only to discover on further investigation, that the very existence of the everlasting punishment with which they are threatened is a matter touching which doubt is admissible. Were the matter less serious, we should be tempted to call a system in which such contradictions can occur a simple absurdity.

The truth is, that a church which encourages its children to examine and prove doctrines for themselves, abdicates one of its chief functions in favour of the private judgment of its members. If it bids you examine and judge what it teaches, it cannot justly complain should you disbelieve and cease to reverence its teaching. The fact of making dogma a subject of examination makes it a subject of doubt, and removes it from the region of faith and devotion to that of reason. That Mr. Gladstone's objection should be made by a religious Anglican, and by a man of his intellectual power, is a striking instance of the inconsistency and the want of grasp of first principles which are inevitable in those who set themselves to defend a position which is logically untenable.

ART. VII.—THE GENIUS OF GEORGE ELIOT.

The Works of George Eliot. In Twenty Volumes. Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1880.

GEORGE ELIOT is dead. She rests where the memory of mystic, contemplative Coleridge lingers still, in Highgate Cemetery. But the earth that lies upon her is counted profane, and she was buried without Christian burial. Some day, perhaps, when the new religion of despair has made her grave a place of pilgrimage, a line from Petrarca will serve to mark it

out, and to perpetuate her creed touching the soul ;—such a sad line as this :

Quel foco è morto, e'l copre un picciol marmo.

For however the spirit be quenched, this rare woman will not rest in a tomb unvisited, like the tomb of that Dorothea, writing whose story George Eliot so mournfully wept over her own. Her forward-looking glance must have beheld in prospect, if nothing more divine, yet still the meed of immortal renown wherewith Epicurean Horace might comfort his vanity. And, before her time, she has gone through the strait and dreadful gate of death to join the choir invisible that peopled her heaven ; though not their brightest invention can make the gladness of an unbelieving world. Not a glorious exchange for her long-lost faith in Christ ; but it is all she desired to win, so far as we have been told. She would seem to have lived without God in the world, "a vacuum at the centre of her faith : " did she die as one that has no hope ? But she has become a great English classic, and ages hence her genius will be admired. She may even be set in the calendar on her birthday, and canonized as Shakspeare is now : she may elicit from many reverence almost equal to his. And all the while she will be lying in the unconsecrated ground at Highgate Cemetery—a pitiable thought !

What she has written of her great hero Savonarola, whom she was held to resemble in cast of features as in texture of mind, is true enough concerning George Eliot herself.* "Seldom," indeed, "have the mysteries of human character been presented in a way so likely to confound our facile knowingness." But all the regard she may claim, and justly, must not turn away our eyes from simple fact. During the twenty years of her celebrity she was pitied no less than she was wondered at. And the manner of her leaving life can but deepen our regret that malign in-

* Grace Greenwood says : "She impressed me at first as exceedingly plain, with the massive character of her features, her aggressive jaw, and evasive blue eyes. But as she grew interested and earnest in conversation, a great light flashed over or out of her face, till it seemed transfigured, while the sweetness of her rare smile was something quite indescribable. But Miss Evans seemed to me to the last lofty and cold. I felt that her head was among the stars—the stars of a winter night." Compare George Eliot's description of Savonarola—a reflected but conscious rendering of her own appearance : "In the act of bending, the cowl was pushed back, and the features of the monk had the full light of the tapers on them. They were very marked features, such as lend themselves to popular description. There was the high-arched nose, the prominent under lip, the coronet of thick dark hair above the brow, all seeming to tell of energy and passion ; there were the blue-grey eyes, shining mildly under auburn eyelashes, seeming, like the hands, to tell of acute sensitiveness."—*Romola*, chap. xv.

fluences should have so wrought upon a noble woman, who was likewise, in her own sphere, a supreme writer.

For, we suppose, there is now no critic, not even Mr. Swinburne, who would refuse to allow her fine qualities. The world at large has recognized in the author of "Adam Bede" and "The Mill on the Floss" an artist who may rank with immortals, a genius creative of single characters filled with breathing energy and of living groups as real as they are original. But not an artist only. Her mind was wide enough to contain philosophies; and if calm deliberate thought somewhat tempers her creating flame, it gives distinction too. It arouses a complex interest in the reader, it stirs a deeper chord than the mere story-teller could hope to reach. And it reveals a soul very strangely and subtly mixed, "struggling amidst the conditions of an imperfect social state, in which great feelings will often take the aspect of error, and great faith the aspect of delusion."

To feel strongly, with a certain quick and as it were passionate response to outward solicitations, is the material essence, not of all high genius, but of an artist's. And to express feeling in such beautiful or sublime or humorous forms as may strike the sense with admiration, overwhelm it with awe and astonishment, move it to uncontrollable pity or scorn or laughter, is the aim of an artist's working, whether in colour, or in light and shade, or in marble, or in speech, or in song. George Eliot's depth of feeling was so great that it sometimes marred the proportion and beauty of her stories by giving them an excessive painfulness. "The Spanish Gipsy," for example, is a book where suffering is overcharged until it becomes almost intolerable, and affects not so much the heart as the nerves. Whenever she chooses to call up her knowledge of life, George Eliot can depict the passions like one who has endured them in every pulse and vein. She has a clear memory, not of the sharp strokes alone that love and envy, ambition, sadness, or disappointment strike upon the soul, but of the light uncertain touches whereby most men are coaxed into a shape they would not choose. Her insight, that seems to leave no chamber of the heart unexplored, springs from her own susceptibility, and is sympathy before it is intuition. Hence the living strength of her characters amid the multitude of wire-hung puppets that romance-writers are perpetually dancing up and down before us. It is true she has, once and again, mistaken an artificial creature for a creation of art: Daniel Deronda is perhaps a thing all leather and prunella, "a wax-doll" in the disparaging critic's dialect. But the test of life in a world evoked by the imagination, is that its personages shall move us to feel as if they were flesh and spirit, worthy to be loved or wept over, and akin, as we are ourselves, to the soul of

things good and evil. Surely this is what we feel when Dinah Morris, the pale Methodist saint, is standing under leafy boughs that screen her from the descending sun, her hands lightly crossed before her, the grey, simple, loving eyes turned on the people whom she is telling of the Divine love and their need of it, her mellow voice the while rising and falling with the varying emotions that make her village sermon a drama. Or, when we are taken into the dairy at Hall Farm, to admire its coolness and purity, its fresh fragrance of new-pressed cheese, of firm butter, of wooden vessels perpetually bathed in pure water; its soft colouring of red earthenware and creamy surfaces, brown wood and polished tin, grey limestone and rich orange-red rust on the iron weights, and hooks, and hinges—and, beautiful enough to make us forget all these charms of a Loamshire idyll, the distracting, kitten-like maiden, Hetty Sorrel, with her spring-tide loveliness and her false air of star-browed innocence. Or, as we watch her tripping along the avenue of limes and beeches, where the golden light is lingering among the upper boughs, only glancing down here and there on the purple pathway and its edge of faintly-sprinkled moss—watch her moving joyously to meet an awful doom disguised in the form of young love and Arthur Donnithorne. Or, as the fern-tufted, sunlit Chase changes to darkling fields, and Hetty wanders over them in search of a pool whose wintry depths may hide her, yet loiters, when she has found it between the bending trees, and does not hurry, because there is all the night to drown herself in. Or, shifting the scene to Florence, when Piero di Cosimo shows us in the sketch Tito Melema, with his right hand uplifted, holding a wine-cup in the attitude of triumphant joy, but his face turned away from the cup, and intense fear in the dilated eyes and pallid lips, as though a cold stream were running in his veins, whilst fierce old Baldassarre is clutching the velvet-clad arm of the fair young traitor that has forsaken him. Or, yet again, when Fedalma, bearing with her, as in a funeral-urn, the ashes of her tribe, looks her last with noble speechless sadness on her Spanish lover, and the great waters swell round the boat and break upon it restlessly; and away, but not far, in the distance are gleaming the solitary shores that must bury her dead hopes and despairing faithfulness. Or, in that book of pitiful lapses from a foreseen and purposed heroism, when Dorothea and Rosamond clasp one another like two women in a shipwreck—the fit symbol of both their lives that destiny had interwoven in a common ruin. What vivid soul-painting is here! For, as we walk through the portrait-gallery of noble women where George Eliot is our guide, and survey the features of Romola and Janet, Gwendolen and Dorothea and Maggie Tulliver, we are conscious that it is not so

much their beauty, though majestic or proud, that makes them gazed upon, but a certain radiance streaming out from the purity in heart, the strong yearning towards good, that the weakest among them cannot altogether lose. A theatrical scenic innocence or repentance they have not always: they might fail on the stage, but it would be for lack of the dramatic situation that shows, even to idle spectators, a soul embodied and recognizable in deeds commensurate with its greatness. In the story the pure soul is ever felt, and at last breaks through the clouds. We may study, to the same intent, the never worn-out sagacity that tracks along its creeping ways of thought Mr. Casaubon's dim life and uninspired self-love, even though he wanders in a wilderness of bypaths, and knows not how to strike upon "the vividness of an idea, the ardour of a passion, the energy of an action," but, present at the great banquet of the world's life, remains himself hungry and shivering. Or the chronicle of Mr. Bulstrode's pale-eyed fears, his daily strivings against conscience (now become his dearest foe), though he does but aim at promoting the glory of God by such a tightened grasp upon the riches from which his soul indeed sits loose, and in the acquisition whereof he has committed only hypothetical sin, deserving contingent pardon. Or that contrast, so little to be expected in the writings of George Eliot, to her own ideal of woman—we mean Rosamond Vincy. In this consummate sketch, beauty as radiant as garden flowers under the evening light, fineness of tone and finished accomplishments, instead of wearing their native grace, are made as repulsive as the livid tints of the grave, as wicked as vice, and more exasperating. It is genius like Nature, and not a mechanic's cunning, that has robbed the starry vision of its halo, demonstrating that human feeling alone can subdue human affection to itself when our season of first delight in beauty is vexed by the world's cares. Rosamond Vincy can move us to pity her still in an hour of trouble; and this is a sign that George Eliot, though making her marvellously inhuman, has not crossed the boundary drawn by right instinct, to search out some monstrous thing in the gloom where the grotesque and the ghastly of late romance have their fit abode. With furies dripping blood from their snaky tresses or scattering flame out of waving torches, she has no acquaintance except in *Æschylus* the thunderous and Eleusinian, or by the hearsay of those that saw Paris aflame with petroleum. She has not painted a Medusa, nor even a modern Mary Stuart.* Amongst her creations we

* Read—or rather, do not read—"Chastelard" and "Bothwell," by Mr. A. C. Swinburne, as final proof that the age of chivalry is gone, and the long-worshipped Queen of Scots brought low indeed,—to the level of Voltaire's bewitched Circean "Pucelle." The triumph of Tragedy!

look in vain for a miraculous perfect villain—a Count Francesco Cenci, or Count Guido Franceschini. With the latter Tito Melema is not properly comparable. (It is curious, by the way, that we Northerners have a superstition about villains when at the noontide of their badness; we look for them in the South, amongst Greeks or Italians.) But Guido is marked by a super-subtle disbelief in goodness of any kind, and rages unrelentingly against the deceit of innocence. Tito is, at most, a Guido Franceschini in the bud. He dies too early, and has not failed often enough, nor felt wretchedness and penury enough in his young days, to harden into that kneaded fire as of hellish adamant. And Grandcourt, though of a like paste with these, is too slight and negative: only misery can blow up the roaring flame that will melt his pride and indolence to scorching enamel. George Eliot prefers to tell us of inexperienced weak Adam, who hardly thinks of virtue or vice at all, but is overcome by the scent of fruits in autumn, and pleads that had the temptation not been so surprisingly pleasant, he would never have dreamt of touching them. And, perhaps, she has chosen wisely. For really the supply of villains does not seem likely to fail—at any rate in literature. It is more to her honour that she creates by combining and refashioning what she has seen in the mind of man or in Nature, thereby securing a beautiful and intelligible analogy with those true sources of emotion, than that she should excite unqualified repulsion and incredulity by inflicting on us something strained and impossible, and, for that cause, ineffectual. Apparently she never knew an Iago off the stage, and has not been solicitous about the creation of a second—perhaps, amongst other reasons, because she had ceased to believe in a place where he might meet with his deserts. Her subtlety and depth of conception, the compressed energy, sword-like edge, grave decisiveness of her words might have warranted her in emulating the style of Shakspeare and moulding Iago to the modern. But she would not copy a book, though the greatest: and her art, if always reminiscence, is never an author's plagiarism. Iago, whose existence some of the older critics, though versed in possibilities, have stickled at, lay out of her horizon. But his make and bearing are Nature itself, and would win our love to him when set by the side of many a "lovely monster" now walking the world. That George Eliot shrank from adding to their multitude proves that her genius was bounded. Yes, by limits of Art.

Or, finally, we may turn towards the wide, clear illumination that has wondrously recovered and lit up for us Medicean Florence, its colours fresh and glowing, as if it were another

Pompeii preserved under the piled-up ashes of history and historians. In its light at last stands bathed the shadowy Rembrandt-like greatness of Savonarola, a name that has never died off men's lips, yet has held in it such uncertain significance, as though troubling the conscience of every one that spoke it, and filling them with scruples that confused the lines not only of parties but of religious convictions. Now we may see him, not as the painters have seen him always, with their childish unquestioning eyes, in the white Dominican habit as he lived, or stripped of it and moving blindly towards the towering gibbet which reminded the Florentines uneasily of an earlier form of torturing guilt or innocence long laid aside. But we may see the inmost man, and the soul, like flawed crystal that, even where it has suffered violence, holds the sunlight, though refracted and discoloured. And if the one unrivalled subject of poetry be human character in powerful conflict and interaction, then may we more than match the tragedy of Prometheus the Fire-bringer with this of Fra Girolamo, even related in prose. For the historic Florentine and the mythical Titan were of one temper; they must be memorable to all time, each for renouncing his own joy, that he might raise men to the highest deeds of which they were capable. And in the history, not in the legend, is there, besides "the reviling, and the torture, and the death-throe," an agony of sinking from the vision of glorious achievement into that deep shadow where the fallen Teacher can only say, "I count as nothing; darkness encompasses me, but the light that I saw was the true light." George Eliot might have insisted upon this consideration herself, for she has the thought, though not touching her hero. As she says in one of her quaint mottoes, "There be who hold that the deeper tragedy were a Prometheus bound, not after but before he had well got the celestial fire into the *narthex* whereby it might be conveyed to mortals." That deeper tragedy, she has, though in her own way, written. Moreover, Prometheus was not man—he was only man-loving; and he was at length to pull down evil from its sovereign seat. We cannot pity him with the tender fellow-feeling that Savonarola's faults do but increase. This man shakes us with changing tones and great human words, as in the sermon of the Duomo: "Behold, I am willing—lay me on the altar; let my blood flow, and the fire consume me; but let my witness be remembered among men that iniquity shall not prosper for ever." By a gesture of the delicate hands, that seem to have in them an appeal against all hardness, he bows us to our knees. Like a sceptred deity, he points the way back for us to the destiny we would fain escape; but the power lies all in a mild glance expressing that simple human fellowship which is the bond between

us. Therefore we do but feel our admiring loyalty suffused with tenderness when we come to know him well—when his character appears to hold some base alloy in conjunction with its finer elements. We are sure that "his imperious need of ascendancy, his enigmatic visions, his false certitude about the Divine intentions, never ceased, in his own large soul, to be ennobled by that fervid piety, that passionate sense of the Infinite, that active sympathy, that clear-sighted demand for the subordination of selfish interests to the general good, which he had in common with the greatest of mankind." And we cannot but hope that George Eliot is delivering the verdict of the ages as she grandly concludes: "It was the fashion of old, when an ox was led out for sacrifice to Jupiter, to chalk the dark spots, and give the offering a false show of unblemished whiteness. Let us fling away the chalk, and boldly say—The victim is spotted, but it is not therefore in vain that his mighty heart is laid on the altar of men's highest hopes." Might such words be true of her who wrote them, too!

If, then, Dorothea be the noblest character George Eliot has drawn, and Dinah Morris the purest, and Maggie Tulliver the most affecting, and Adam Bede the most manly, and Tito Melema and Rosamond Vincy the most marvellously clever, yet, as drawn from history and not a free representation, Savonarola is the greatest. Here is none of the cheap invention where ignorance finds itself able and at ease, but an invention that is the very eye of research, and holds the clue to those invisible thoroughfares which are the lurking-places of anguish and delight, inspiration or mania, crime or benevolence, and are thus the real, though little suspected, channels of success or disaster. The story called "*Romola*" is history made present and romance become an epic. What praise can be higher than this?

Creative faculty, then, upon a scale large enough to be discernible by the multitude, and to draw forth their instinctive plaudits, George Eliot certainly has. Whilst her types are all as distinctly marked as they are the genuine yield of experience, some of them may claim to be species never before described. And these, being original as well as lifelike, must win for her a portion of that glory the world has bestowed on Goethe as the maker of Mephistopheles, and on the sublime lunatic that invented "*Quasimodo*" and "*L'Homme qui Rit*." But genius strikes a deep root in the living earth that brings it to the sun; it has its peculiar complexion, resulting more closely than we can ever tell from the frame it dwells in. A woman cannot change from being Sappho, though her song may be as fine or as sweet as any of Homer's. And it is now imagined that the passion-wrought antique Lesbian has survived, or transmigrated rather,

into our present age, and is making her dreams pass again, if not through the cold mass of marble or colour, yet into the drama and romance. For the first time since authorship began, it is now possible to form a group of imperishable writers out of women alone. Every country in Europe may boast of a great name; and France has inherited the glory and the shame that cling to the greatest of them—George Sand. But is there in England a woman worthy to share the throne with Shakespeare as his equal or his consort? The fame of Elizabeth Barrett Browning cannot be divided—any more than the tender beauty of those “Sonnets from the Portuguese,” which even she could not surpass,—from that of a grandly tragic poet. And Shakespeare’s choice—if he is minded to exchange Anne Hathaway for a genius that will appreciate *his* sonnets—must lie between George Eliot and Charlotte Brontë. But perhaps he has a taking already for one of his own delightful creations, though we cannot remember a “great soul” amongst them. In any case, we need hardly choose for him. Charlotte Brontë, out of her intense and eager life, has created those strange true beings that have no parallel, except in lives that shrink from the pain of recording their own anguish—Jane Eyre, Lucy Snowe, M. Paul Emanuel. They deserve to be thought miracles of unconscious art, for in them the most opposing qualities are fused, by some inexplicable passionate feeling, into mere and absolute reality. There is no need to prove they are alive—we see them live; perhaps for a chapter or two they represent the reader’s own past to him. Not of outward accidents, but of the inward spirit is deep tragedy an issue, and Charlotte Brontë has proved to the world’s astonishment that “we may be strangely moved by what is not unusual.” Ordinary human life has within it the sublime elements of pity and terror—the pathos of loving or not being loved, the dreadfulfulness of parting and death; but how seldom do the commonalty upon any level, high or low, perceive it! George Eliot comforts our dulness with a word, saying that if we had such a keen sense of every day, it would be like hearing the grass grow and the squirrel’s heart beat, and we should die of that roar which lies on the other side of silence. But herein, as the critic has well insisted, Charlotte Brontë finds the empire of her genius and her supremacy. With such common materials as the sombre moods of a governess earning her bread in a country-house, or in a *pension* at Brussels, the slight occurrences of a fête-day among schoolgirls, the monotony of a summer vacation passed alone, the beginnings and growth of attachment between a teacher of French literature and an English Mademoiselle, in neither of whose lives did there appear to be crime or mystery or grandeur of suffering—with these broken bits of faintly-tinted glass

Charlotte Brontë has kindled for us a kaleidoscope of burning gem-like colours, and has wrought, not a fantastic but a true and serious pitifulness in the story of unnoticed men and women, to the very quick of experience and with overpowering vastness. Think of Lucy Snowe, meant to be as unromantic as Monday morning and as cold as her name, kept by social condition and the events that fill her days (or leave them almost empty) as far from romance as any Sarah Smith in a factory, and how marvellous a thing it is that she takes the heart and the fancy like Ophelia or Juliet! What directness and simplicity of action! What an easy, robust, picturesque speech! And how few strokes of the sure pencil ere the scene stands out, finished and clear! In no other Englishwoman has the "fine frenzy," the passionate inspiration, as we now term it, of the poet's gaze, created visions at once so like Nature and so weird.

Not in George Eliot, we think, even when she is telling over again Maggie Tulliver's fall and ruin. Whilst with Charlotte Brontë we seem to be absorbed in the life that is acting itself out, with George Eliot we stand always, though it be only a little, on one side, and resemble the chorus and not the players. It has been urged that self-possession like this is too intellectual, too reflexive, and argues a dull overfed temperament, incapable of the divine exhilaration that genius—and opium—brings on. Is it the chorus which makes the drama, or is it the players? True: but George Eliot's admirers will rejoin that chorus and actors may be resolved into a more primitive, yet not less poetical form—the epic representation, namely, of the living world, which is at once a panorama and a creed. For the solitary figure we may take the people of a city, the dwellers on a country-side; for the destiny of an individual we may sing of the love that mankind feel for earth whence they spring, the thoughts they cherish concerning Heaven to which they look up. As the chorus gave expression to human feeling on the tragic stage, so, when it is no longer a separate theme, when it runs indistinguishably through all the music of the rhapsodist, it may shadow forth the eternal laws by which all things move and are. George Eliot has this greatness to herself, amongst Englishwomen, and Charlotte Brontë can no more take it from her than Jane Austen can. Doubtless it implies a certain affinity of her mind with the masculine, which is considered to dwell chiefly upon laws and abstractions. Goethe has often been called the Poet of Science. George Eliot perhaps deserves the name of the Epic Pythoness of Science. But she was not exalted to the tripod of this new Delphi and poetic oracle of the nineteenth century without a severe probation. She has painful memories of the time when, as Maggie Tulliver, she hoped that to master "Latin, Euclid, and Logic would be a

considerable step in masculine wisdom." And it was then she would take Aldrich out into the fields, and look off her book towards the sky, where the lark was twinkling, or to the reeds and bushes by the river, from which the waterfowl rustled forth on its anxious, awkward flight—and would feel with a startled sense that the relation between Aldrich and this living world was extremely remote to her. "The eager heart," she says touchingly, "gained faster and faster on the patient mind." Pity that as the days went by she unhappily came to imagine Kant and Spinoza and Mr. Herbert Spencer were fountains of wisdom. But at last she felt herself converted to the new formula, which seems to run in this wise, briefly: "There is no God, and Science is His oracle." Now the Pythoness, as we know, wrote indifferent hexameters, not nearly so musical as the lines of the "Iliad." But in them she made clear to Greeks the will of Zeus and Apollo. She kept the public conscience and was the echo of a divine voice in the cities of men; she rebuked the moral obliquity and shed light upon the entanglements and labyrinthine deceits wherein wickedness seeks to lie hid. She must have had a vision, then, such as science or inspiration may bestow, of the essential, right, and infinite relations of the wide world; and it was her feeling of that beauteous order that lifted her above the multitude. Such a vision did George Eliot think she had. It was not her calling to teach the facts of science, but to distil from them the true religion of mankind, to clothe its mysterious sayings in the finest imagery, and to interpret its bearings on the life of every day.

But where shall the modern Pythoness erect her tripod and deliver the messages of the new gods? Times are changed since heralds were sent with presents to Delphi and Dodona, that they might bear back the god-spoken word. And now the Pythoness must be content with *Blackwood's Magazine* as a channel of utterance, or must scatter her mystic leaves as a three-volume novel. This may seem to be cheapening vital truths; and it has led the superficial to deny that a new religion was coming to the birth because they nowhere perceived the solemn garb of a prophet, or heard of any fresh Bible except the Book of Mormon. Upon us it is incumbent to dismiss these childish fancies, and to recognize in the novel its usurped but now unassailable function as an instrument of scientific and religious teaching. There is no likelihood that the epic of our century will be written in verse. But, surely, more than one fragment is already extant of an epic in prose where we may view the movements of thought and the succession of determining events as in a looking-glass. Victor Hugo, Balzac, George Sand, are the epic historians that offer us a faithful saddening chronicle of the newer France.

Across the Rhine we have the famous writer Berthold Auerbach, in whose pages the king and the peasant move along, and life in Southern Germany casts up, as from below the horizon, a parting gleam of mediæval romance and piety into the modern sky. It is natural that poetry should freeze at the chill breath of science and unbelief, and the roar of business in our great cities. To an age so curiously observant as ours, so disdainful of earnest convictions, so utterly embroiled in sifting particulars one by one, neither the epic calmness nor the dramatic greatness would seem attainable. But when poetry fails we are driven upon sounding the possibilities of prose. This George Eliot was born to do: and her finest and least mortal work is that wherein she has striven, not to apply the technical language of science in matters of feeling, nor to win a reputation for herself as an artist in verse, but to frame her own wide experience into an epic whole. And it is in this, her peculiar province, that she has found no English rival or compeer—in the large Homeric representation of the living world. She fulfils her calling as a Pythoness by moulding history so as to suggest or enforce the theories wherewith science has imbued her. Thanks to her deep feeling and her marvellous gift of writing as she feels, the dry light of knowledge shines golden across her vision, shot through with orient beams of love and pity.

Hence the wide field of her view, the throng of personages that occupy or move over it, the impartial and seemingly indifferent survey of high and low, believers and infidels, pious and wicked, pure and impure; hence the absence of a hero, except when a symbolic rather than a real character is meant; hence the disregard of conventional situations and stereotyped endings, which sometimes leads to careless neglect of the entanglement and corresponding dénouement required by art; hence, especially, the minor interest attaching to the tale of love where the love itself is not complicated with a larger motive. She has, indeed, written in her most affecting work of the love that is "a potent fatality;" but she prefers it when, to quote a fine-toned sentence, "it acknowledges an effect from the imagined light of unproven firmaments, and has its scale set to the grander orbits of what hath been and shall be." From all which it follows naturally that her modern epic is far wider in its range of phenomena than the ancient or mediæval, and at least as minute in depicting them. And as it is not inspired by the genial muse of Homer nor by the Christian grace of Dante, as an abstract system rules instead of divine religious instincts, no wonder that George Eliot has been thought to deal harshly with her creations, and as if she were an *Ananke* or Fate that could not be propitiated.

When we view the work complete—and, logically, "Daniel

Deronda" carried it to the final chapter, after which we could expect only repetitions or variations of an accustomed theme—we see that its parts fall of their own accord into a certain grouping. To the first series belong "Scenes from Clerical Life," "Adam Bede," "The Mill on the Floss," "Silas Marner," and "Felix Holt." To the second very distinct series belong "The Spanish Gipsy," "Romola," "Daniel Deronda," "Theophrastus Such." The link that combines these groups and gives a point of transition from one to the other is "Middlemarch," though in order of time it succeeded "Romola." The first series, which is likewise the most popular, may be taken to represent George Eliot's earliest and most vivid experience. The second is founded rather upon culture than feeling, and grows more and more theoretic, until at last it seems to melt away into a thin cloud of abstractions. Between "Scenes from Clerical Life" and "Theophrastus Such" there is a difference as wide as between a painting in oils and a pencilled outline. Her first book abounds in lusty life, her last is a study of comparatively bloodless shades; for unbelieving theories will blight the richest experience and spoil its humour. In her early writings, George Eliot draws from the fountain of youth; she prizes the living soul she has known above any lesson it may afford in the disturbing light of newly-imported philosophies. She may then have held somewhat by a wise remark of Goethe's; that a rich and manifold life passing across our field of vision has a certain worth in itself, and will convey a moral, though we should not point it. In her latest books the lesson is inculcated with such abstract clearness that the figures which exemplify it sink down into mere symbols, like the painted Vices and Virtues in the miracle plays.

From their searching and minute accuracy of detail, and their multitude of sharp outlines, the earlier group of her stories have all but incurred dispraise at the hands of many critics as no better than photographs, due to mechanical observation and not to genuine art. This condemnation always excepts "Adam Bede" and the biography of Maggie Tulliver. And, certainly, it will not be denied that, when fine touches are made too perceptible, they weary an eye accustomed to large bold drawing; just as the small Oriental alphabets, though exquisite, fatigue an ordinary sight. One can fancy the impatient novel-reader flinging aside "Silas Marner" or "Amos Barton" with the sense that he has been counting all the bricks in a wall or trying to decipher the dust on a fly's wing in the microscope. George Eliot, however, had a design in her dulness, and defends it from criticism.

I share with you (she says) the sense of oppressive narrowness, but it is necessary that we should feel it. Does not science tell us that

its highest striving is after the attainment of a unity which shall bind the smallest things with the greatest? In natural science, I have understood, there is nothing petty to the mind that has a large vision of relations, and to which every single object suggests a vast sum of conditions. It is surely the same with the observation of human life.

Thus, then, she would, as it were, lay upon her photographic outlines the soft blooming colour of the epic unity and life; the details are beneath an artist's consideration only when severed from the electric current which endows them with unseen energies and far-reaching consequence. And this, perhaps, is true so long as the human proportion (art's essential postulate even where it least is indicated) be not broken by dissection into the infinitely little or by its disappearance in the infinitely great. Her most taking story, "Adam Bede," is that wherein George Eliot has kept this proportion, we think, quite faithfully. Our comfortable sense in reading it is a proof of the practised eye that has here disposed the figures on a canvas neither too large nor too small, and with due regard to the perspective and standing-point of life rather than science.

However much, then, we may blame the photographic hardness, the dull and painstaking flatness even, of her work upon occasion, George Eliot has painted life in the country with a simple warmth and grace that leads many to quote Hermann and Dorothea, and to speak as we have spoken of the Loamshire Idylls. This attractive word—now fast losing the significance it formerly had, and becoming synonymous with Tennyson's poems and the "Morte d'Arthur"—may in some loose and large sense describe "Silas Marner," "Janet's Repentance," and "Adam Bede." Passages of idyllic loveliness or humour we may, indeed, find interspersed through her volumes until we reach the over-speculative "Daniel Deronda." For when all the other gods and goddesses have been dissolved into their lucid atoms, George Eliot will worship still her kindly Mother Earth, to whom, as she says, we owe it, that

always there is seed being sown silently and unseen, and everywhere there come sweet flowers without our foresight or labour. For though we reap what we sow, yet Nature has love over and above that justice, and gives us shadow and blossom and fruit that come from no planting of ours. X

With happy insight she lights up for us the primeval mystery of association, that, long before Arcadia and Sicilia were praised in song, or the gathering of the vintage in Attica was become world-famous for its tragedy, had consecrated to Religion things entirely common. Through her eyes we perceive how natural a thing it is when peasants hold the plough sacred and dedicate the wain

to Ceres and Cybele. Why should seedtime and harvest not be festivals to the gods, and the implements of husbandry holy, when the early and the latter season give cause to venerate the beneficent simple things that, like friendly hands, procure us a manifold sustenance, filling our hearts with food and gladness? This is true piety, and no superstition, exceedingly tender towards God, as it is brave and healthy in the soul where it springs. Mayhap when we, the latest seed of time, come to recognize a divinity in the cotton-mill and the steam-engine (though it were only, as Mr. Ruskin says, the lesser Phthah or deity of mechanical fire), our trouble of scepticism will begin to have an end. But George Eliot's Mother Earth was a local divinity, not the mere name of a universal power: she was the goddess at whose knees she had grown up, a Midland goddess, with green raiment mildly beautiful when the sun shone down upon it, and a garland of corn-flowers mixed with the apple-blossom. Vine leaves, and the shouting at the winepress in southern lands could never charm George Eliot's fancy like the chant of "Harvest home!" rising and sinking in the distance, whilst the last load of barley was winding its way towards the yard-gate of the Hall Farm, and the low westering sun shone right on the shoulders of the old Binton Hills, turning the unconscious sheep into bright spots of light; shone on the windows of Adam Bede's cottage, too, and made them aflame with a glory beyond that of amber or amethyst. That was enough to make her feel that she was in a great temple, and that the distant chant was a sacred song. In a later book she says, exquisitely:—

We could never have loved the earth so well if we had had no childhood in it—if it were not the earth where the same flowers come up again every spring that we used to gather with our tiny fingers as we sat lipping to ourselves on the grass—the same hips and haws on the autumn hedgerows—the same redbreasts that we used to call "God's birds," because they did no harm to the precious crops. What novelty is worth that sweet monotony where everything is known, and loved because it is known? The wood I walk in on this mild May-day, with the young yellow-brown foliage of the oaks between me and the blue sky, the white star-flowers and the blue-eyed speedwell and the ground ivy at my feet—what grove of tropic palms, what strange ferns or splendid broad-petalled blossoms, could ever thrill such deep and delicate fibres within me as this home scene? These familiar flowers, these well-remembered bird-notes, this sky, with its fitful brightness, these furrowed and grassy fields, each with a sort of personality given to it by the capricious hedgerows—such things as these are the mother tongue of our imagination, the language that is laden with all the subtle, inextricable associations the fleeting hours of our childhood left behind them.

And so Maggie Tulliver, when she read about Christiana passing "the river over which there is no bridge," always saw the Floss between the green pastures by the Great Ash.

Therefore George Eliot has not painted the infinite horizons of deep blue sky that are seen from Alpine summits, nor the wild waters that lay so far off when she was a child, nor hardly that "Midland Sea, moaning with memories," that she came to know on its Italian and Spanish coasts when she had travelled some way on in life. No object in Nature "haunted her like a passion," unless it had been a part of the dead years that still lived in her and transformed her perception into love. Such is not the idyllic tone to which Theocritus and the "Pastor Fido" have accustomed our ear. It does not melt into mere animal joyousness nor vibrate with panic terror: it is too human to be quite rustic. The bovine gravity whereat we have laughed so often with George Eliot would surely ripple over a little more into smiling, could it feel so delicately as this. But even a Sicilian peasant—unless he were some god turned shepherd for the nonce—would smile towards the sun and the olive-clad slopes of Etna with eyes less intelligent than the affectionate melancholy gaze of George Eliot across her Loamshire fields. For she never can forget the vast world and the fateful issues of life; upon the narrow scene of Hayslope village a pitiful tale may be enacted that will leave long memories of terror in the country-side. Her border of rustic beauty is embroidered on the pages of an epic song, wherein the gods descend to battle against man as well as for him, and the unseen powers make love "that endures for a breath," the mighty instrument of measureless ruin. But apart from the sense of sorrow, which is, however, the persistent undertone that deepens all her music, one can hardly imagine George Eliot likening herself to Theocritus or accepting the somewhat superficial praise that her stories were idyllic. She would rather be Teniers than Theocritus. She takes pleasure in many a Dutch painting which lofty-minded people despise, and finds a source of delicious sympathy (and a style kindred to her own) in these faithful pictures of a monotonous homely existence, which has been the lot of so many among her fellow-mortals.

I turn (she says in a well-known passage), without shrinking, from cloud-borne angels, from prophets, sybils, and heroic warriors, to an old woman bending over her flower-pot or eating her solitary dinner, while the noonday light, softened perhaps by a screen of leaves, falls on her mob-cap, and just touches the rim of her spinning-wheel and her stone jug, and all those cheap common things which are the precious necessities of life to her.

But here again we have come upon that secret of deep human

sympathy which raises George Eliot from the crowd of miniature-painters, that love prettiness or pettiness, to the epic height. She would not blind herself to the vision of the ideal—at least she thinks so—any more than the divinest poet.

Paint us (she says) an angel, if you can, with a floating violet robe and a face paled by the celestial light; paint us yet oftener a Madonna turning her mild face upward and opening her arms to welcome the Divine glory. But let us always have men ready to give the loving pains of a life to the faithful representation of commonplace things—men who see beauty in them and delight in showing how the light of heaven falls upon them. There are few prophets in the world; few sublimely beautiful women; few heroes. I can't afford to give all my love and reverence to such rarities; I want a great deal of those feelings for my everyday fellow-men, especially for the few in the foreground of the great multitude, whose faces I know, whose hands I touch, for whom I have to make way with kindly courtesy.

This is very loving and loveable; it recalls many a humorous gentle touch in her writings, some of the words we remember soonest when we think of George Eliot, or the scenes whereon we linger most willingly. But how remote from the classic idyll! To Hermann and Dorothea, such feelings are much more akin. George Eliot, we do not doubt, often murmured to herself some saying like the good Pastor's :

Ich

Tadle nicht gern was immer die gute Mutter Natur gab.

For neither could *she* bring herself to despise a gift, however slight and vulgar-looking, that came from the hand of Nature. But can there be a quality more requisite or more helpful in searching the mysteries of man's heart than this rare humour that, whilst it views all things, great and small, in their relation to the infinitely Perfect, as if it were Faith, yet bears with their limits and their feeblenesses, as if it were Charity? Here are the finest elements of our nature combined spontaneously; wide-glancing intelligence softened by love until it learns to be tolerant, love intensified by prevision of impending loss. George Eliot desires, if that may be, to taste no delight which shall make her unfaithful to the past. She has a more trusting belief in Nature than in self-confident, aspiring, much-devising Man. Irreproachable perfection she would wish to see spread far above, like the bright distant heavens; but she does not feel herself at one with it. Her affection dwells in past years, and is tender towards everything that is old and homely, or that has missed the mark by mere lumpish stolidity, and not by clever malice. She is not so resolute in reforming away the ills of life as those noble Radicals who seem to have derived their name from dis-

obeying the Lord of the Harvest, and manfully rooting up the tares and the wheat whilst both are green and somewhat indistinguishable. Custom demanded her reverence, as it had won her earliest love. And the same temper which strengthened her clinging to all natural growths in spite of their irregularities—their departure from the type beheld in vision by Linnæus or Owen—stirred up in her a half-comic jealous feeling towards the fine speculations that create a Dogmatist of peremptory sentences on paper and a Jacobin with unyielding formulas in the world of action. Perhaps to her keen eye it did not appear that the American cheapness, as of brittle, because hastily forged, metal, that marks our modern advantages, is a sure proof of their lasting worth. Large-hearted as she was, how could she help crying out against the scientific wire-fences wherein we are all going to be penned by the culture of the day? What wonder if she was given to wistfully looking back to the hedgerows that wasted the land, indeed, with their straggling beauty, but shrouded the grassy borders of the pastures with catkin'd hazels, and tossed their long blackberry branches on the corn-fields? Hers, she amusingly said, was not a well-regulated mind; it had moments of slumber when imagination

did a little Toryism by the sly, revelling in regret that dear old brown, crumbling, picturesque inefficiency was everywhere giving place to spick-and-span, new-painted, new-varnished efficiency which will yield endless diagrams, plans, elevations, and sections, but, alas! no picture.

Thus did she take a quaintly malicious pleasure in setting the Past against the reforming Present, and at all times find food for innocent laughter.

George Eliot, as we have often thought, is the aptest illustration of Thackeray's true saying, that "Humour is wit tempered by love." For indeed it is a quality that comes of the "one touch of Nature" that "makes the whole world kin," and that bids us in a friendly voice remember that we somehow share a little in the imperfections we are so brilliantly mocking. Some have said that Humour perceives "the soul of good in things evil." We had rather say that it mingles with the mood of irony some spice or condiment of humble patience, which is a belief in the pardonableness of faulty man. Take away the capacity for good in George Eliot's peasant-folk, or in the large mind that is considering their way of life, and you will have slain the soul of humour in her, leaving only a contemptuous thin-lipped scorn instead of it. And you will have set her down from the company of Cervantes and Shakspeare to which she is entitled by this gift most of all.

Certainly she has nothing that astonished the world more than her abundant humour. The annals of Parisian civilization and Madame de Sévigné notwithstanding, it was held, at least in England, that a woman could hardly see the point of a jest and did not relish one. Humour, like the theory of ideas, was the *differentia* or distinctive mark of man; or, as George Eliot calls him somewhere, "the male human being." A humorous person was very likely coarse; and, indeed, Smollett and Fielding gave ordinary minds some foundation for thinking so; whilst scholars might, among themselves, illustrate the same tendency from mighty-mouthed Aristophanes and rude old Plautus. There may be still some readers, neither finical nor lackadaisical, who think that George Eliot's humour does occasionally border on the gross; and it is, once in a way, more massive than delicate. But these are spots on the sun. George Eliot is not only a great humorist, in spite of her sex, but it seems clear that she is the greatest—except Carlyle—in modern literature. If Thackeray's feeling had equalled his brilliancy, he might have greatly fulfilled his own definition, and contested the palm with her. Dickens is prolific in monsters and caricatures, odd fancies and impossible comicalities, and is a delightful showman of dreams and shadows; but much as we are in debt to him for laughable situations, we find him neither grave enough in his cast of features nor wise enough in his manner of thinking to be perfectly humorous. The fun of his earlier books is too noisy and stage-like; the jesting which he exchanged for simple fun, latterly, is too strained. He can never mean a good thing without wrinkling his face all over, like an ill-trained clown in the circus. And he has not often discerned the real incongruities that seem to lie in the very nature of things when Reason views them. In this respect Rabelais, Swift, Sterne, and Jean Paul may have overtopped all rivals. But George Eliot is quite worthy to be named with them for her keen sense of the essential ludicrousness that clings to the finite and the individual. It may be said, indeed, that she has inherited the humour of the first three with only the most distant touch of their grossness, and as much of Jean Paul's kindliness as might consist with renouncing his faith in Christianity.

Her humour, like the melancholy of which it is sometimes the parent and sometimes the offspring, is compounded of many simples and has the most varied applications. The humorist in grain goes counter to the world's established form; he is sad at a wedding-breakfast and makes a pun at a funeral. He cannot help fancying that whatever the respectable in society take to be quite square is always a little lopsided and out of shape. He has a perverse vision of fine films connecting the sacred with the

profane, and the venerable with the ridiculous, which no one else would have seen had he refrained from pouring his sunlight on their gossamer. There is in him some lack of the perfect homage to imperfect men which is secured by a good dulness, though he may still be more flexible than the average, and not less obedient. Humour, like every species of originality, carries with it a peril for the owner, and is liable to explode upon him as well as his friends. But George Eliot, being many things besides a humorist, has not driven in her liking for incongruities over the precipice, though she comes to its very brink. When Mr. Herbert Spencer bids her look through the telescope he has borrowed from Mr. Darwin, and behold in prospect the Survival of the Fittest—for modesty will not allow us to presume that the day is already here—she draws back in alarm, and asks what is to be the fate of all the lovable oddities whom she remembers in the country and has still an admiration for? It does not soothe her to be told that unless they perish the world cannot be perfect. She objects to perfection at such a price. Never will she believe in the undertaker's heaven, where all faces are composed to a decent solemnity; nor in Coleridge's, where Charles Lamb would be admitted only on condition of developing his imperfect sympathies into perfect dulness, and could surely not revere a man whom he had once playfully taken by the nose, as there is an unfounded though plausible legend that he did to Wordsworth. Poor George Eliot! she could not resist the suspicion that our modern progress, if not checked in time, might land us, like Mr. Brooke's studies—anywhere! When doing good to one's neighbour had grown into as complete an instinct as keeping one's balance; when, the struggle for existence having come to an end by the bringing in of perfection, there was nothing in the world to help or hinder, and things had reached that state of democratic equality and unvarying evenness which we ominously call "a dead level;" what, she said to herself, would be the motive to keep on living a moment longer? Shudderingly she cries out—

'Tis a poor climax to my weaker thought
That general middlingness.

And in this mood she strikes upon her deep-voiced organ such a dismal chord as Mr. Stuart Mill brought out, to every one's surprise, on his somewhat piercing scrannel-pipe, a few years ago. He called up, as we remember, a vision of all the glory that should be, when the reign of benevolence and atheism had wrought the universe to the pattern designed by his flinty-hearted father. And he asked himself, Shall I be happy then? An irresistible foreboding whispered No; and the poor enthusiast

of benevolence sank in the waters of despair. Henceforth he would forego happiness, and be content with advancing his theories. And has not Mr. Matthew Arnold apologized for his own occasional high spirits on the plea that they cannot last? "You know," he says, in a deprecating tone of sadness, "we shall soon be all yawning in one another's faces." Man used to be defined, by a supposed inseparable peculiarity of his, as "a laughing animal." But M. Comte and Mr. Spencer will ere long have changed all that. Even smiling may come to be looked upon as prehistoric—at all events when it is directed against the sacred doctrines of Positivism.

However, except in this unaccountable shying at the luminous shadows of a future, she devoutly—we cannot say prays for, but—hopes in, George Eliot has a steed that answers the rein well, and his curvetings and demivolts are but to show off her unrivalled skill in the *manège*. How pleasant to stand by and watch them! Impossible to read the opening pages, say, of "Janet's Repentance" without a touch of compassion for the unconscious denizens of Milby, who little thought that their accurate knowledge, fine satire, and genial sense of their own importance, and of the manifest pettiness of any world outside their borders, were to make inextinguishable laughter for all England a hundred years hence, and all because one quiet-looking person (whose religious gravity may have been the only thing to remark about her) was just within earshot, and took note of them! But Milby may find comfort in the reflection that St. Ogg's is not a whit less ridiculous, though somewhat less interesting; and Treby Magna has only the privilege of demonstrating that its political wisdom was worthy to match the religious uprising against Mr. Tryan at Milby, and the moral protest of St. Ogg's against Maggie Tulliver.

If drawings in the manner of Hogarth, or groupings like the well-known School of Athens, were in vogue—and it is a pity they are not—one might fancy a great tableau of the humours of George Eliot set over against a great tableau of the humours of Charles Dickens, say at Burlington House. The contrast would be striking, and the effect upon the average spectator remarkable. What an astonishingly rich, animated, multitudinous picture; what comic situations, queer figures, grotesque, overdrawn, impossible attitudes; what visions of a good-humoured nightmare and Carnival of Goblins, the canvas of Dickens would exhibit! How like a laughable dream, how unlike the sights of every day, even amid the picturesque horrors of unfashionable London! George Eliot's drawing would appear by comparison sober and prosaic; her faces not queer and distorted, but of a simple human ugliness; her situations common and not often theatrical; the

lines not lengthened into caricature, nor twisted to the impossible-grotesque, but seriously, nay anxiously, correct. We should not be able to keep from laughing with Dickens and at him; and our laughter would easily melt into sentimental, or perhaps genuine pity, when he chose to demand it. George Eliot would have, indeed, her groups of Laughers and Laughables, and she would excite our better feelings not less than Dickens; but the humour would never be sentimental, and whilst we were amused we should begin to reflect as well. Mr. Casaubon, with the Key to all Mythologies mislaid in a hundred note-books, his features making known to us that not even immortal fame in this world, and a happy eternity in the next, are a soothing balm for the poisonous criticism of Carp (Carp, whom he has been led to address as "*nullo ævo perituro*"), would surely be more humorous, because more true to Nature and more tragic, than half of Dickens's droll fancies. And how penetrating would be the humour of Rufus Lyon's surroundings and doctrines—all the more so, because he is a lovable upright old man, with deep and earnest thoughts and a brave spirit. Note, again, the subtle touch in describing Mrs. Poyser—she is pale and in delicate health—and how sharp an edge it gives to her sarcasm whilst heightening our conviction that she is drawn from the life. And a wide canvas that should take in the great square of the Mercato at Florence for a foreground, having in perspective the dingy streets of Milby and Middlemarch, where the sky itself seems only a strip of soot-begrimed calico, would offer us, indeed, a mixed and motley company from George Eliot, but nothing incredible, or the product of an unrestrained fancy. It is so commonly expected that the humorous will not be true—will be somewhat far-fetched and improbable; for humour is an irresistible solvent of reality, and a token that we have escaped from the control of the men and the opinions we hold up to its gentle scorn. Whence no institutions on their trial can bear to be ridiculed (if they have any weak points), and laughter is the beginning of revolt or reformation. But George Eliot, intent upon bringing into clear sunshine the limitations of English character, the inadequacy of English beliefs, would defeat her purpose by airy unsubstantial caricature, and when she makes a man laughable must demonstrate that he is so, not by any accidental mishap, or seen through the comedian's spectacles, but in the very eyes of Truth and Love. To laugh with George Eliot is to decide against human folly by appealing to the ideal of human or divine perfection. For there is a true laughter and a false. Peasants laugh at refinement, citizens laugh at genius or humility, courtiers laugh at honesty, and the world laughs at religion. It is only the philosopher and the saint that laugh

at essential unreason; and their laughter is seasoned with knowledge and compassion, and perhaps the hope of better things, or, at least, the vision of their possibility. George Eliot construed her experience in the light of an immense theory, and felt for mankind (the word is not too large) as one that desired no happiness which all might not share. She was never made to be a satirist, bounding her notions of good and evil by the conception of civilized and transient social forms. Nor would her cast of thought encourage the beautiful unrealities, the slight and morning dreams, the easy forgiveness of a Christian poet whose tone, like that of Charles Dickens, vibrates to love rather than fear. Her sympathy for man is not the "child of golden hope," but of deep and tender pity. The grave will right many wrongs, the future will bring in a peaceful holy age; what more can science or its religion promise? Not that God will wipe away the tears from every eye; for Heaven is only the vision of the ideal, and never can be a fact. But if our grief has an end with ourselves in the dust, why be so troubled? and if there is good in store for the race, why not strive towards accomplishing it? How laughable our regard for self; how piteous, too! How delightfully comic the contrast between our submission to social statutes, and our genuine likings and schemings to have our own way! How unaffected, loving, helpful we might be, did the spirit of the Christian teaching rule us! How ridiculous and unhappy we shall remain until we learn those principles of true knowledge, or science, which make it clear that, however the Christian legends may be exploded as mythical, the sayings of Christ, the self-sacrifice of Christ, the humanity of Christ, the compassion of Christ, must enter as elements into any theory of religion that is to govern the future.

Therefore the creative genius, the keen eye and loving heart for all things natural, the unselfish tolerance, the grave and serious tone, the spirit of humour subdued by knowledge, the beseeching earnestness, the unwearying sympathy, the ever-growing sadness, that have made George Eliot a familiar great name amongst us, are combined into their peculiar form, and receive a distinct energy from the religion that George Eliot preached, and, in some degree, practised. It is a religion that many other leading spirits profess to hold; but none have given expression to its mysteries in shapes so clear and beautiful, nor can we trace its development from ancient creeds, and the mutual relation of old and new, with such epic breadth, humour, and liveliness as in the pages she has recited out of her own history, and the history of her age. No criticism of her characters can be worth attempting unless we take her purpose into account; and when we have looked upon Dinah Morris, Adam Bede,

Maggie Tulliver, Dorothea Brooke, and Daniel Deronda, through the eyes of the great woman that has drawn such remarkable personages for us, we shall have gained an insight into the New Religion that has so grand a literature of its own, and threatens to grasp hereafter the sceptre of social sovereignty. If it survives for long, it must be in the form that George Eliot has given it. And the question deserves our study, how long that form can last? Or shall we not have to say of it, as of her—not so many days hence?

Quel foco è morto, e'l copre un picciol marmo.

ART. VIII.—CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN CENTRAL AFRICA.

1. *The Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII., of December 3, 1880, on Christian Missions.*
2. *Les Missions Catholiques.* Lyon.
3. *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith.* London.
4. *The Jesuits: their Foundation and History.* By B. N. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

THE only considerable region of the earth which has been left, down to the present generation, as absolutely virgin soil for missionary enterprise, is the teeming heart of what the most daring of modern pioneers has aptly called "The Dark Continent." To the far East and the far West the Gospel had long ago been preached. Huron and Iroquois, by the inland seas of America, had heard its message of peace from the Black Robes who penetrated their prairie solitudes to deliver it. China and Japan had given confessors and martyrs to the faith announced to them from beyond the setting sun; and even the central plateaus of Mongolia and Thibet, the great cradle-land of primitive man, the parent hive of all the nomad swarms of Asia, had been explored by dauntless missionaries in search of new fields of toil and conquest.

But on the benighted regions of Central Africa no twilight of illumination had yet dawned, no morning-star of truth had ever so faintly glimmered, and the uncounted millions of its population lived and perished, generation after generation, without other tradition than that of rapine and carnage, other creed than ferocity and superstition, knowing nothing of the world without, or knowing it only through the still worse barbarities of the slave trade. Those vast equatorial regions, hidden behind impassable barriers of scorching desert and trackless forests, of

pestilential jungle and reeking morass, were until lately as effectually cut off from the rest of the globe as though situated on another planet, and the tropics still kept their central mystery sacred from the prying gaze of the white man. There, in the great laboratory of the sun, Nature, unregarded of science, exults in her own monstrous fecundity, attended by not less monstrous activity of destruction; prodigal of life, she seems to riot in a fantastic exuberance of creative force, and to fling forth in reckless profusion whole systems of organisms, only to see them devour and prey upon each other. Earth, quickened by the stimulus of the solar energy, teems with germs, and, like a seething hotbed, forces them into sudden and luxuriant vitality, followed by correspondingly swift dissolution; the very surface of the waters becomes clogged each season with a tangle of succulent vegetation, swept away the next, a festering mass of decay; the putrescence of one generation feeds the rank redundancy of the succeeding one; and the cycle of life and death, of annihilation and reproduction, runs its round with a lavish and wasteful expenditure of individual existence.

In this tremendous orgie of Nature, the interests of man, generally her first care, seem neglected or forgotten, and he appears, as it were at his peril, an unwelcome intruder on the wanton moods of the universal mother. All the elements conspire against him, and are prolific of forms of life hostile to his own. The earth breathes poison, the waters exhale miasma, the air is pregnant with the germs of fever. Misshapen creatures of huge bulk and ferocious instincts wallow in the river mud and gambol in the steaming lagoons; fierce and powerful brutes roam the desert plains and ambush in the dense forest; and swarms of winged plagues, with venomous bite or sting, make war on the traveller in his own person, or in those of the indispensable four-footed companions of his journey.

When we consider, moreover, that the human denizens of the region thus triply guarded by Nature are races of powerful savages of sanguinary and predatory habits, we need no longer wonder that Central Africa should have remained down to our own time as much a *terra incognita* as the lunar deserts, and the secret of the sources of the Nile been still the unsolved secular riddle of geographers. How it has fallen to the lot of this generation to see the mystery of ages at last cleared up, and the heart of Africa, if not yet wholly, at least in great part, laid bare, is a story fresh in our readers' minds, from the narratives of the series of hardy adventurers who, one after the other, plunged dauntlessly into the gulf of that unknown world, and brought out each his quota to the gathering stock of information respecting it.

The result is visible, if we compare a map of Africa produced some twenty years ago with one filled in with the details of recent discovery. In the former, the great continent, with the exception of a comparatively limited area along the coasts, is a void, featureless blank; while in the latter we have its leading traits already sketched in, and its gigantic lake system and central watershed almost completely outlined, like a portrait waiting for the final sittings before receiving the finishing touches. A whole library of travel has been written giving minute particulars as to the inhabitants of these vast regions, and the modes of penetrating their inmost recesses; so that the route from Zanzibar to Ujiji, with all its perils and difficulties, seems as well known to us as that from London to St. Petersburg, and the sanguinary etiquette of Mtesa's court, on the shore of the great Nyanza, is as familiar to our minds as the routine of royal ceremonial at Madrid or Vienna. An enormous field of inquiry and research has thus been thrown open to us, only comparable to that which the great discovery of Columbus disclosed to our ancestors, now nearly four centuries ago.

This, then, is the inheritance of the nineteenth century, given, as it were, in trust to it for all futurity. This great waste vineyard is made over to the present generation, to plant and water, to tend and till, that it may give forth fruit in due season; these countless millions of dark brethren, left till now in brutish ignorance, in spiritual blindness, in moral degradation, are given in charge to modern Europe, with all its vast machinery of intellectual and material progress, to humanize, to elevate, to civilize, to instruct. To her have been committed the keys of knowledge and the seals of thought; nor will it be sufficient for her to declare, like the first fratricide, that she is not her brother's keeper. A great moral responsibility accompanies the task. How will it be performed?

It cannot but occur to any one who studies the early missionary history of the Church, to reflect with something like a feeling of discouragement how much more abundant was the visible fruit garnered by the preachers of the Gospel among the heathen some centuries ago, than that reaped by their successors at the present day. We read of missionaries exhausted by the mere physical labour of administering baptism, of whole tribes and communities converted in a day, of neophytes crowding into the church faster than the zealous teachers could find time to instruct them. At the opening of the seventeenth century, Japan numbered 750,000 Christians, and 5,500 natives were baptized in the year 1604 alone. The Jesuits had thirty houses and various other dependencies scattered through the empire; while the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians were also estab-

lished there.* In China, in the year 1661, the Jesuits had 151 houses and 38 auxiliary residences, the Dominicans 21, and the Franciscans 3 churches, while the Jesuit mission, founded in the province of To-Kien in 1625, was so prosperous as to have built in a very short time 17 churches. In India, about the same period, the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Jesuit missionary Father Roberto de' Nobili and his colleagues baptized in the course of a few years, 100,000 natives, principally Brahmins; and in the following century (1737), Tong-King, in Cochin China, contained 250,000 Christians.† And while such was the progress of the Church in the East, in the West, the faith was embraced by nations of Indians, whose Christian settlements were long models of primitive innocence and virtue.

Missionary enterprise in our own days can point to no such striking results as these, and it may be worth while to ask ourselves why it should be so? The Gospel certainly has lost none of its efficacy to touch the human heart and understanding, nor are its preachers wanting in zeal and self-sacrifice. How is it, then, that their efforts are crowned with a measure of success so comparatively scanty?

The cause of the falling-off must obviously lie in some change in the conditions under which their teaching is presented, and is probably to be found in the other influences of modern civilization to which their savage disciples are exposed, previously to, or contemporaneously with, those of religion. The very extension and multiplication of means of communication, which give material facilities for their task, throw moral obstacles in the way of its accomplishment, by allowing counteracting social forces to have equal access to their fields of toil. The tares are sown along with the wheat, and exhaust the soil before the good seed has time to germinate. The Gospel of Mammon excludes the Gospel of Christ from the ground which it occupies by what the Americans call "the right of pre-emption." Commercial morality in its lowest form (for the standard of honesty is not likely to be raised where the pressure of public opinion is removed, and the customers are only ignorant savages) is too often, to the black man, the first practical exposition of the working of the white man's creed, and all subsequent impressions made by it on his

* It seems that some descendants of these early converts still retain a traditional attachment to the faith, as Baron Hübner, a recent traveller, says there are villages inhabited exclusively by Christians, and certain families in which the office of baptism is hereditary.

† These facts are taken from the interesting work quoted at the head of this article, "The Jesuits, their Foundation and History," in which the wonderful story of the Society, though told in the sober language of history, has all the interest of romance.

untutored mind are apt to take their colour from this earliest experience. Modern trade, in a word, with its pursuit of purely material aims, and consequent lowering of the whole tone of thought, is the great foe of the spirit of Christianity abroad as well as at home.

But the most demoralizing agency which civilization brings to bear on barbarous races is the unchecked distribution among them of alcoholic drinks, moral and material poison to their excitable natures and unseasoned constitutions. Sir Arthur Conynghame, in his work "*My Command in South Africa*," gives a deplorable account of the strict application of free trade principles to the sale of spirits among the native Africans adjoining the British Colonies.

The facility (he says) with which these untamed savages (Kafirs) can obtain any amount of villanous drink is one of the most fruitful sources of danger. Some of the chiefs, being aware of the evil, forbid canteens in their localities, and have repeatedly requested that the same prohibition should be extended among the adjoining (British) districts. The answer of authority has always been, "that the natives should place a moral restraint on themselves, and not imbibe more than is beneficial; and that trade cannot be impeded, simply because it may engender evil consequences among the natives."

Comment is needless on the complacent indifference with which British political economy thus washes its hands of all care for the welfare of the weaker brethren, who make such excellent customers for excisable goods. No wonder that Livingstone, discouraged by the slow progress of conversion among the aborigines, should have written:—

If our missions would move onwards now to those regions I have lately visited, they would in all probability prevent the natives from settling into that state of determined hatred to all Europeans, which I fear now characterizes most of the Kafirs near the Colony. If natives are not elevated by contact with Europeans, they are sure to be deteriorated. It is with pain I have observed that all the tribes I have lately seen are undergoing the latter process.

To the same effect writes Lieutenant-Colonel Butler in his volume of brilliant sketches of travel recently published, when describing the South African diamond-fields:—

Diamond stealing is on the increase. The negroes are yearly becoming more dishonest. It is a sad fact, but a true one. What produces this result? Unquestionably it is contact with civilization. It is one thing to tell this black man that it is wrong to steal; it is another thing to let him see, day after day, white men buying stolen stones; Jews and Christians, and men who are neither Jews nor

Christians, prowling round the pit, and offering money at random for the morning's find.*

The evidence of missionaries is of the same tenor; one of those established on the coast of Guinea wrote in 1847 :—

There is a wide difference as to probity and morals between the blacks of the interior and those of the sea-coast, who are in frequent communication with Europeans; these latter have unfortunately learned nothing from our compatriots up to this, but to drink brandy, smoke, and commit all sorts of excesses. Commerce with foreigners will be always an obstacle to the success of the mission. We ardently desire the time when we shall be able to fix establishments far from the coast and all its causes of scandal.

And Monsignor Comboni says of the Soudan country :—

The first period of the existence of the Vicariate had shown that the negroes on the White River had become corrupted by the visits of Mussulman traders, and Eastern and Egyptian Christians. Some Europeans, and above all the Giallabas, had introduced with themselves the most hideous vices.

It would seem, then, that the influence of civilization, apart from that of religion, works unmixed evil among barbarous races, and if the antidote were not introduced with the poison, we should be compelled to answer the question put above—How will Europe fulfil the task of regenerating Africa?—in an absolutely unfavourable sense. But the Church, divining the necessities of humanity, with her inspired instinct in her vocation, is nerving herself to keep ahead of civilization in the race on whose result is staked the future of Africa. Deeper and deeper into the wilderness her flying columns plunge, farther and farther inland the missions are advanced, striking, like so many converging arrows of light, towards the shrouded heart of the Dark Continent.

And here we may pause to pay a passing tribute to the great missionary pioneer of Africa, of whose work all denominations of Christians will reap the benefit. The name of Livingstone is a passport to his fellow-countrymen among the savage tribes he passed through, and many a one will gather the harvest in the field where he first turned the furrow. Nor, while we condemn the errors of his creed, need we deny full recognition to the incalculable indirect service he rendered religion, by first associating it in the negro mind with his lofty standard of probity and rectitude in his dealings with coloured men. The ennobling effect of his example on native character was shown in the touching fidelity of the black followers among whom he died,

* "Far-out. Rovings Re-told." By Lieut.-Col. W. F. Butler, C.B.

far from all other companionship, by the swampy shore of Lake Bangweolo. With a thought that was poetic in its sympathy with his life's work and aims, they buried his heart under a baobab-tree, in the centre of that continent for which its last pulse had throbbed, and then bore his remains, sometimes by stratagem to save them from native hostility or superstition, always at the cost of personal toil and danger, in safety to the coast, where they consigned them, as a precious deposit, to the hands of his countrymen. Surely in the long record of his wanderings and explorations there is nothing more wonderful than this, the brief story of his last journey towards his far distant home.

Where the coast of Africa is fringed throughout with European settlements, a chain of Catholic missions has long been established, like so many beacons linking one point with another, and much has been done for the native population within their reach, despite the antagonistic influences just pointed out. The ecclesiastical constitution and jurisdiction of these various districts have been fully described in a former number of this Review,* and we will not therefore recapitulate the information there supplied. Enterprising missionaries have also at various times journeyed far into the interior of the country, but only as casual pilgrims, and never with a view to permanent organization. For a Catholic Mission is like the advanced column of an army; it must not only penetrate the enemy's country, but at the same time keep up its communications with the main body, and cannot subsist in absolute and definitive isolation. It is only the extraordinary stimulus given to exploration within recent years that has supplied the necessary conditions of its existence at any considerable distance from the shore-line of Africa.

The Church has not been slow to take advantage of the new opening thus created, and from north, south, east, and west, attempts are now being made to push forward religious colonies on the track of recent discovery. Three principal expeditions stand out conspicuously as the most adventurous among many others recently started, and it is the history and vicissitudes of these that we propose in this and succeeding articles to sketch for our readers, first enumerating the various obstacles, moral and material, that the physical and social conditions of Africa offer to their progress, as well as the circumstances that seem hopeful for their success. The oldest of these recent exploratory missions is that now directed by Monsignor Comboni, dating from 1846, with Cairo for its starting-point, and the little known regions of Nubia and Kordofan as the theatre of its operations.

* January, 1879. "The Evangelization of Africa."

Then come the French missions to Equatorial Africa, organized by Monseigneur Lavigerie, Archbishop of Algiers, and already established, though by the latest accounts in a somewhat precarious position, in the great Nilotic basin, on the shores of Lakes Tanganyika and Nyanza, with the caravan route from thence to Zanzibar as their line of communication. A still further extension has been given to the vast region already assigned to the Algerian missions by the projected establishment of two additional settlements farther west—one at Kabebe, in the country of Muata Yanvo, accessible from the Tanganyika direction, the other at the northernmost point of the Upper Congo, to be reached from the West Coast by the course of the Congo itself.

Finally, the Jesuit mission to the Upper Zambesi, especially interesting to the inhabitants of this country, as it has been confided to the English Province of the Society, and has made the British Colonies of South Africa its point of departure for the interior of the continent, where it is now established.

The difficulties, moral and material, that lie in the way of the success of these undertakings can scarcely be exaggerated, and it may be as well to lay them briefly before our readers, that they may understand how arduous a task the missionaries have to grapple with, and how little it is to be wondered at if the results of their labours are somewhat slow in growth.

To the first category of obstacles belongs polygamy, with all the disorganization of domestic ties it inevitably brings, and which, from its deeply-rooted hold on the minds and prejudices of the African races, forms an almost insuperable barrier to their adoption of Christianity.

Next in order comes the desolating influence of the internal slave trade, whose brutalities have been so feelingly set forth by Livingstone, and whose horrors so weighed upon his mind that his later writings are one long cry of protest against it. Whole tracts of country, where the vestiges of recently flourishing communities still remained, were found by him absolutely depopulated by its ravages; while the various miseries it entails, by fostering unceasing raids of tribe against tribe, and village against village, in order to enrich themselves by the capture of these human cattle, would furnish forth pages of harrowing details. For descriptions of these barbarities, and the scenes of sickening butchery of the failing and infirm by their savage captors, as their strength breaks down in the march to the coast, we refer the reader to the records of African travel, which are rife with instances of similar enormities. Suffice it to say that where the slave trade prevails, missionaries, from their irrepressible hostility to it, are viewed with suspicion, and their task is almost hopeless in seeking to preach a religion of love.

Finally, among the hindrances to missionary enterprise in Africa, the increasing spread of Mahometanism through the continent must be counted, since it is imbued with a spirit of far more uncompromising hostility to Christianity than the idolatry and fetichism it supplants. Indeed, the wretched negroes are indebted for many of the evils that afflict them to the incursions of the Arabs, who, to say nothing of the most prominent of these, the trade in human flesh and blood, leave behind them everywhere a taint of physical and moral contamination, introducing vices and diseases previously unknown. As they invariably abstain from capturing slaves among tribes professing Islamism as their creed, it is only wonderful that all the races of the interior of Africa do not hasten to declare themselves votaries of a faith conferring so great an exemption. Many indeed have done so, and among these proselytes of a religion so much more in accordance with their habits and traditions than Christianity, the missionary is doubly at a disadvantage.

These are some of the principal difficulties he has to overcome as a teacher, but not less formidable are the obstacles that present themselves to his actual bodily progress towards the scene of his labours. Miasmatic exhalations prevail to a great extent through the entire of the equatorial region of the continent, but are especially poisonous in the level tracts lying between the central uplands and the sea. Thus the entire coast may be considered as lined to a considerable distance by a fever-haunted zone, in which any prolonged sojourn is perilous, and often fatal, alike to natives and white men. Certain districts, again, are infested by the tsetse fly, and this winged scourge, whose bite is deadly to nearly all beasts of burden, renders ordinary means of transport impossible through great part of Africa. Horses, oxen, mules, and camels, alike succumb beneath its attacks, which the ass alone, of all draught animals, seems entirely proof against. The result is, that the whole carrier work of Central Africa is done solely by men, and as each porter must carry, in addition to the traveller's luggage and equipments, an equivalent in some form for the food consumed by him on the way, the number of bearers required is largely out of all proportion to the effects transported. The absence of any portable currency among the natives necessitates the taking of bulky wares, such as cloths and cotton stuffs, sufficient for payment by way of barter, for all supplies required. A perfect army of coloured carriers must therefore attend the steps of a single European traveller, who requires in addition an armed escort to protect him from attack. Thus the cost of African travelling and transport is enormously enhanced, and, to take one instance out of many, Commander Cameron's expedition from the east to the west coast cost a sum of no less than twelve

thousand pounds. Add to these difficulties the absence of roads and bridges, the delays occasioned by floods, swamps, and impenetrable undergrowth of jungle, the incessant stoppages caused by illness or misconduct among the porters, the wearisome negotiations with petty chief after chief, the interruptions to traffic by internecine wars along the route, and some idea may be formed of the utter uncertainty that overhangs every stage of an African journey.

But while land traffic is thus impeded, water-carriage, despite the gigantic streams that carry the equatorial rainfall to the sea, is rendered absolutely impracticable by a singular feature in the conformation of the country. From the broad level tracts that belt the coasts of Equatorial Africa, the flanking ranges, buttressing up and enclosing the great central water basin, rise in steep successive flights, and may be compared to a massive pedestal with spreading base, in which is set a gigantic trough. Thus while the flat zone by the sea-shore is a land of sluggish streams, and the regions of the interior have in most parts the same character, the rocky staircase descending from the higher to the lower of these levels, is travelled over by the great equatorial streams in a series of falls and rapids, that make them utterly useless as highways of commerce. On the Nile, navigation is interrupted in this way for a considerable part of its course, while above the last cataract it admits again of steamboat traffic for hundreds of miles farther towards its source. The great river of Western Africa, the Congo or Livingstone, hurls itself over the abrupt declivities of its bed in that interminable succession of boiling rapids which delayed Stanley's famous canoe voyage five months, in the weary effort to transport his goods past these obstacles. The Zambesi casts itself headlong down a vertical cliff into the abyss of a yawning chasm, and goes raging down the gorge in smoke and thunder. The Tugela, in British South Africa, leaps the mountain-wall of the Drakensberg, and gains the plain of Natal, twice a thousand feet below, in two consecutive flashes of arrowy descent.

This impetuous character of the African water-courses, which extends to the tributary as well as the main streams, is ascribed to their comparatively recent origin, as they have not yet had time to wear down the irregularities of their beds to a uniform declivity, and seems to countenance the theory held by some geographers as to the physical history of the continent. According to this view, its central concavity was once completely filled by a great inland sea, of which the present lake system is but the shrinking remnant, while the saline deposits found in many parts of the same region are proofs of its extension in other directions. When, through some change in conditions of climate, the equi-

librium long maintained between rainfall and evaporation was destroyed, and the influx began to gain on the waste by heat, the accumulating surplus of water must necessarily overflow its bounds, and the great reservoir then bursting its circling dam at several points, the mighty rivers leaped forth through the shattered gateways of the hills, hastening by their several paths to the sea. The precipitous steepes or rocky inclines which all alike meet at a certain point of their career, form an impassable barrier to their use as channels of communication, and this geographical feature is one of the principal causes contributing to the inaccessibility of Central Africa and the barbarous isolation of the vast regions thus fenced in from all contact with the outer world.

But while the difficulties here enumerated in the way of missionary enterprise in Africa might seem sufficient to discourage all but the most ardent spirits, the records of travel contain some incidents calculated to reanimate the zeal of Christendom, showing that the negro races, however slow to adopt the faith, are capable of retaining and transmitting it with tenacious fidelity, even when cut off from all external aids to religion. No one need despair of the future of Africa who reads the accounts furnished to us by missionaries and explorers of the survival of a traditional form of Christianity among isolated communities, formerly evangelized, but again abandoned, and left for generations without rites or teachers of religion. Such a community was discovered by some French missionaries sent to the West Coast of Africa in 1773. In the kingdom of Kacongo, on the north bank of the Livingstone River, they came upon a group of Christian villages, whose inhabitants received them with the most enthusiastic demonstrations of joy. The ancestors of these people had emigrated from the neighbouring kingdom of Congo, at that time completely Christianized, during some of the wars by which it was devastated, and, carrying with them a deep-rooted attachment to the faith, had retained it in the midst of the heathen population by which they were surrounded. There they constituted a separate colony of about 4,000 souls, settled in twelve little villages, the principal one being called Maguenza. The missionaries were received and lodged by the chief, and were led to the little church, where, before an altar surmounted by a cross, the natives were accustomed to celebrate their form of worship, singing canticles in their own language in double chorus, praising the divine mercy and imploring grace not to relapse into idolatry. The missionaries remained a week among them, preaching, instructing, and baptizing some hundreds of children. So great was the anxiety of the inhabitants to see their children received into the church, that two women who had not heard of

the arrival of the priests till after their departure, followed them for a distance of thirteen leagues, carrying their infants to receive the sacrament. The missionaries left, promising to return or send other priests, but were unable to do so, and nothing further has been heard of this interesting colony. May it not be that the religious whom the nations of Europe are casting out with contumely, are destined to be the new apostles of some of these forlorn children of the Church, who pine for the teachers rejected among their own people?

A similar Christian settlement has recently been discovered and restored by Father Duparquet, Prefect Apostolic of Congo, who, hearing of its existence, though scarcely believing in it, sent Father Carrie on an exploring voyage in March, 1876, and some months later made it the site of the new mission of St. Antoine. It had been founded by the Capuchins in 1645, and abandoned by them, owing to the disturbed state of Europe, early in this century. The church, originally built in the capital of the little principality of Sogno, now stands isolated in the midst of a vast plain, the town having been abandoned in the course of native wars. The slaves attached to the convent formed themselves into an independent community, called "The People of the Church," and continue to elect their own chiefs, of whom the present, Dom Pantaleon, is the seventh since the departure of Father Seraphim, the last of the friars. An old man, who had lived in his time, remained as guardian of the church, with the right of presiding over the worship still held there, and so tenacious was the little community of their ecclesiastical privileges, that when the new mission was established they insisted it should be in their midst, instead of in the neighbouring town. Having overcome all opposition to their desire, its members proceeded to construct the dwellings of the priests with their own hands. In the sacristy all the altar-plate was found in safety, and amongst other objects were brought to light a cross of chased silver and exquisite workmanship, with the name of the artist, Fernando Porto; a censer by the same hand, with the date 1668; a number of statues, a silver gilt chalice, &c. During the short visit of Father Duparquet, 131 people received baptism, and he left there a flourishing Christian community. He collected a number of the hymns which the people sing in their own language to their native melodies, still remembering the Catholic prayers taught them by the monks.

In an opposite quarter of the continent, in Upper Ethiopia, or the country of the Gallas, similar settlements of Christians, surviving in the midst of paganism, were found by the French traveller, M. d'Abbadie, who wrote an interesting account of them to the Comte de Montalembert, in October, 1843. Of one

of these groups of Christian families living among a Mahometan population he says :—

This is now the fourth generation for which they have been without priests, and the rich are obliged to send their children to Gogam (in Abyssinia) to have them baptized, for the Ethiopians, as you know, erroneously believe that baptism cannot be administered by a laic. The touching perseverance of these poor people is nothing short of a miracle. But this is not all. Adjoining Essarya is Nona, where the Christians are very numerous, nearly three hundred hearths. One of them, a fortunate warrior, has acquired great influence in Nona; he is educated enough to calculate the time of Easter. He is to be seen with his co-religionists celebrating all the feasts of the Abyssinian Church; but for more than a hundred years Nona has had no priests, and not one of these Christians has been baptized.

In another district, he says, the people, who were without a single minister of religion, were to be seen on Sunday evenings leading their children and flocks round their churches, crying at the top of their voices, "We invoke you, Mary." And further on he describes an extensive country, which he says was the refuge of all the Christians of the Sidam race, occupying the region between the 7th and 10th degrees of latitude, from the advance of the Gallas. These people had sent envoys to Gondar, imploring some of the priests of the mission to accompany them home, but in vain; the difficulties at that time were too great. Perhaps the recent persecutions encountered at the hands of the monarch of Abyssinia by the mission of the Gallas, in the persons of Monsignor Massaja and his colleagues, may be the means of bringing these abandoned congregations once more into contact with Christendom, as it has compelled the missionaries, hitherto restricted from penetrating into the interior of the country, to take a more circuitous route to their stations, and thus to visit on their way remote and hitherto neglected districts.

The Egyptian conquests in the Soudan have opened a way into the heart of the continent, for the mission which Monsignor Comboni, Vicar Apostolic of Central Africa, if not its actual founder, has developed from a comparatively small nucleus to its present importance. The district under his jurisdiction has an area greater than the whole of Europe, and contains an infidel population of a hundred million souls. It was created a Vicariate by Gregory XVI., on April 3, 1846, when the Jesuits undertook its spiritual care, transferring it, in 1861, to the Franciscans. The mission in its earlier stages was not very prosperous, as the climate proved a fatal obstacle to its progress, and the stations first chosen were so ill-selected, that out of four points determined on as bases of operation—Khartoum, Gondokoro, Ste. Croix, and Scellal—the three latter have had to be abandoned, and a new

direction given to the advances of missionary exploration. The enterprising prelate who is now the guiding spirit of Christianity in this vast region, with a true Apostolic vocation, consecrated himself in January, 1849, being then only seventeen years of age, to the mission of Central Africa, moved to this determination by the account given by Father Vinco, on his return from the country, of the abandoned state of the population. Ten years later he was sent to Khartoum, where he learned the Denka and other African languages, and formed the plan, which he carried out later with the assistance of the Bishop of Verona, Marquis of Canossa, and lineal representative of the great Countess Matilda, of founding two institutes for priests and nuns specially devoted to the missions of Nigritia. The first was established in 1867, and in November of that year he started from Marseilles at the head of a band of associates, consisting of three priests, three nuns of the Order of St. Joseph of the Apparition, and thirteen negresses, educated at the Mazza Institute of Verona, and destined to be made use of as native teachers. Two of the missionaries, Fathers Stanislaus Carcereri and Joseph Franceschini, were priests of the Order of St. Camillus, who, on the suppression of the religious orders in Italy, had obtained leave to associate themselves with him for five years. Thus Africa profits already by the prevarication of Europe, and "the whelps do eat of the crumbs that fall from the table of the children."

The missionary caravan took the way of Cairo, enjoying the protection of Egypt, the only Mahometan State whose rulers, following the traditions of Mehemet Ali, have adopted to a certain extent the civilization of the West, and are anxious to afford every possible facility to Christian teachers. Thus, the late Khedive, on the representation of the Austrian Consul, bestowed on the missions of Central Africa a piece of land in the Ismailish quarter of Cairo, valued at 43,000 francs. Here was founded, in 1867, an institution for the education of negroes, as well as for the acclimatization and training of missionaries for Central Africa, under the direction of the Verona Seminarists and the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Apparition. In 1872, the mission of Khartoum, with all its dependencies, was ceded to the religious of these Orders by the Franciscans, who had suffered much during their residence there; and in May of the same year the Abbé Comboni, Superior of the Institute at Cairo, was created Pro-Vicar Apostolic of the mission of Central Africa, thus entering on that enlarged sphere of activity which has since afforded scope for his untiring energy and zeal.

The region committed to his spiritual charge occupies the vast area extending to the frontiers of Egypt and Tripoli on the north, to the Sahara and the two Guineas on the west, bounded

on the east by Abyssinia and the Red Sea, and having for its southern limit the wholly or semi-fabulous Mountains of the Moon. It comprises a population little known to the rest of the world, ranging through all shades of dusky hue—brown, dun, and ebony—and as various in their habits and manners as in the colour of their skin. Within its boundaries are comprised those strange uncouth races visited and described by the celebrated German explorer Dr. Schweinfurth—the fierce Niam-Niam, the terrible man-eaters, of whose revolting banquets he brought the relics to Europe; the diminutive Akkas, whose stature almost justifies the classical fables of the pigmies; and the powerful Monbottu, with their wild songs and dances, and the savage ceremonial of their barbarous Court. Among tribes so isolated and uncivilized, the diversity of tongues spoken offers a great difficulty to missionary teaching, since, never having been reduced to literary classification, they must be learned in the country through the medium of native interpreters, and cannot like the Oriental languages, be acquired beforehand in a preliminary course of study pursued in European colleges. Monsignor Comboni calculates the number of idioms spoken in Central Africa at a hundred, these dialects consisting principally of monosyllables, and expressing only a very limited range of ideas, such as are connected with material objects or sensations. The Arabic spoken in Africa is also extremely corrupt, and consists of a number of dialects unknown to European students of language. Much assistance has been afforded to the missionaries in their efforts to acquire some medium of communication with the natives, by the compilation of a dictionary of Italian and Denka, one of the principal idioms of the country, the work of Father Mitterruntzner, Canon of St. John Lateran, and Director of the diocesan seminary of Brixen.

It is not, however, to that quarter of the Vicariate made known to Europe through the explorations of Dr. Schweinfurth, that Monsignor Comboni's efforts to extend his mission are at present directed, but rather to the provinces lying to the south—Nubia, the Egyptian Soudan, and Kordofan, countries notorious as the great centres and channels of the slave trade debouching in the valley of the Nile. Among these provinces the English Proconsul, Gordon Pasha, ruled with absolute power over a country five times as large as France, and extending as far as the great twin lakes, foster-parents of the infant Nile. His mission, in which, with the austere exaltation of a biblical hero, he believed himself predestined to success, was the suppression of the commerce in human flesh and blood, and with this object he established a cordon of military posts along the course of the Nile, where fugitive slaves were received and sheltered, the

authorities being in many cases obliged to feed and maintain as well as emancipate them. These regions are cut off from European commerce and travel by the arid wastes of the great Nubian Desert, interposed like a zone of fire between them and Upper Egypt. Across its scorching ridges all goods and passengers must be transported on camel or dromedary back; the navigation of the Nile, during that part of its course which encircles with a great loop this inhospitable region, being interrupted by the succession of cataracts in which it descends from the plateaus of the interior to the sunken trough of the Valley of Egypt. The fatigue of the passage of the desert is increased by the necessity of traversing it in a series of forced marches of ten days, almost without a halt, as the total absence of water along the way limits the time spent in the journey to that for which a supply can be carried. The Soudan railway, projected, but far from being completed, is intended to bridge the gap in the communications between Egypt proper and its southern provinces; while the design was also entertained by the late Khedive, that man of many schemes, of enabling ships to pass the cataracts of the Nile by an inclined plane, up which the force of the falling water itself should be made use of for the traction engines required to draw them.

Meanwhile Khartoum, the principal station of the Vicariate of Central Africa, is two months' journey from Grand Cairo. It is the capital of Nubia, and a considerable town of some 30,000 inhabitants, but its prosperity, which was principally due to the iniquitous business of the slave trade, has received a sensible shock from the raids of Gordon Pasha and Sir Samuel Baker, and its leading merchants are gradually transferring themselves to a more undisturbed field of enterprise in Kordofan. Although from its central position it must continue to be occupied as a basis of missionary operations, Monsignor Comboni disapproves of it as a station, from the unhealthiness of its site. Situated close to the junction of the Blue and White branches of the Nile, the country about it at the rainy season forms a lake, in which fish may be caught almost from the windows, while the retreating waters leave the ground covered with bloated batrachians and venomous scorpions. The same objection applies to all stations on the banks of the White Nile, which are, according to the experience of Monsignor Comboni, everywhere miasmatic; the fish of the river are unwholesome, and its waters clouded with a white sediment. This view is confirmed by Colonel Long, of the Egyptian army, who explored the Nile through great part of its course to the Victoria Nyanza, and describes the country traversed by him from Gondokoro to the Equator as fatal to the life of Europeans, and even of Arabs, though acclimatized to the tropics.

Nor need we wonder at the poisonous exhalations prevailing in these localities when we consider the vast amount of organic decomposition constantly taking place in the great forcing-house under the Equator, and the enormous mass of vegetable putrefaction annually swept away by the flushing of the water-channels during the tropical rains. The last-named explorer describes the considerable sheet of water which he discovered, and named Lake Ibrahim, as completely overgrown with a floating jungle of aquatic vegetation—cane-brake, sedge, lotus, and papyrus—so dense as to be only passable by the narrow channels cut by the natives for their canoes; and a similar barrier, impenetrable even to a steamer, is encountered on many of the reaches of the Upper Nile.* It is this portentous exuberance of growth and decay that gives the waters of the inundation their fertilizing quality, and fattens the Valley of Egypt with a stratum of virgin soil endowed with all the prolific virtue of the tropical sun.

The presence of this mass of decomposing material renders the banks of the Nile to the south of Khartoum ill adapted for human habitation, and this was one of the principal motives influencing Monsignor Comboni to choose Kordofan in preference, as the chief scene of his apostolic labours. Even before the charge of the Central African Missions had been formally entrusted to him, in October, 1871, he organized and sent out an exploratory party from Cairo, consisting of the Camillien Fathers, Carcereri and Franceschini, with the lay-brothers Bertoli and Polinari, to report upon El Obeid, the capital of Kordofan, as the site for a missionary establishment. They made the voyage in the usual way by *dahabieh*, or decked sailing boat, up the Nile as far as Korosko, the port of the great desert. In crossing the scorching waste on camel-back, they suffered much from want of water, owing to their inexperience in using new skins without washing, in which their supply turned bad very early in the journey, but otherwise described the hardships of this route as exaggerated. At Berber, where they again struck the Nile, they took boat for the remainder of the way to Khartoum, where they were received by the missionaries then established there. They quitted it, once more on camel-back, on the 1st of January, 1872, and having crossed the current of the White Nile, entered Kordofan, where no missionary had ever previously

* A terrible illustration of this feature of the country is afforded by the last news which has reached Europe from it. The Egyptian flotilla for the suppression of the slave trade, commanded by Gessi Pasha, became entangled in the *sudd*, or water-jungle, of the Upper Nile, and for three months was detained in the effort to force a passage. Provisions failed, and the remnant of the expedition which reached Khartoum only escaped starvation by feeding on the bodies of their dead comrades.

penetrated, on the 6th. They experienced much difficulty in finding their way through the unexplored country, as they were without trustworthy guides, and their maps proved utterly unreliable, but they were received everywhere with the greatest hospitality by the inhabitants, who made them welcome to a share of all they had, and refused to accept any payment for food or lodging.

The little caravan, after some circuitous wanderings, finally arrived in safety at El Obeid, where they were well received, and promised facilities for opening schools, and fixing their residence there, as they were eventually desired to do. The town is charmingly situated under the shade of trees, and is growing in importance, as many of the merchants of Khartoum have removed thither, owing to the restrictions placed on the traffic in slaves in the latter place. Of the population about two-thirds are negroes, described as having no religion, and kept as slaves by the Arabs, of course Mahometans, who form the rest of the inhabitants. There is a public slave-market, and the human chattels are sold at prices varying from 150 to 300 francs. The soil, though sandy, is productive, and might easily be made to yield two harvests in the year, but the natives are indolent, and do not make the most of it. The greatest heat, which occurs in May and June, seldom exceeds 36° Reaumur, and as fever is not very prevalent, the country seems adapted for the residence of Europeans. Provisions are generally cheap, but Kordofan depends for its sustenance entirely on the rainfall, and if this fails the soil becomes utterly unproductive. Running water there is absolutely none, and it is, in fact, a series of oases, the site of its habitations being determined by the neighbourhood of a well, where a subterranean spring can be reached by digging.

Monsignor Comboni was not slow in going to take possession of his new spiritual territory, and having returned from a trip to Europe, whither he had gone to enlist fresh recruits for the campaign against infidelity, he started from Cairo on the 26th of January, 1873, at the head of a party of thirty fellow-labourers, comprising nuns, priests, lay brothers and negress teachers. By the usual route up the Nile, across the great Korosko Desert, and by the river again, they reached Khartoum, and were received in State by the Governor-General of the Soudan and other authorities, while even the Mussulman population went to meet them, chanting hymns not unlike the Christian psalms. Similar honours were paid to the new prelate on his first visit to El Obeid, where he arrived on June 19, 1873, and where the sale of slaves was suspended for several days as a special compliment to him.

But a still further extension of his undertakings was in his

mind, and circumstances gradually led to the execution of his project. As far back as the year 1849, when he was himself little more than a boy, he had observed, in the service of the Counts Miniscalchi, a Christian negro named Bakhit Coenda. This man, whose good character and conduct had given the penetrating young Italian a high opinion of the qualities of his countrymen, belonged to the tribe of Gebel Noubas, and the course of his apostolic career had led the then ecclesiastical student to the borders of the country inhabited by this very people, in southern Kordofan. The conclusion he had long ago come to in distant Italy, as to their improvability and fine qualities, was now confirmed by observation on the spot, for he perceived that the Egyptian military authorities were particularly anxious to collect recruits for the army from amongst them, while in the slave-market at El Obeid, they were equally at a premium, fetching from fifty to a hundred francs more than captives of other tribes.

Accordingly, when Said Agha, one of this people, was presented to Monsignor Comboni within a month of his arrival in the capital of Kordofan, he received him with particular attention, and the Noubas was shown all the wonders of civilization existing in the Mission, in the hope that his visit would lead to others. Nor was this expectation fallacious, for on the 24th of September following, no less a person than the Cogiour Cacoun, or priest and chief of the Noubas of Delen, appeared in person at the residence of the missionaries, with twenty followers in his suite. Much as he had doubtless heard of what he was to see, it was evident that the reality far surpassed his expectations, for as the good fathers put forth all their simple wiles, and displayed their little store of European treasures, seeking to win the approval of the savage chief on whose capricious fancy so much depended, his exclamations of wonder and astonishment were the best testimony to the success of their efforts. The process of knitting, and sundry other ordinary European arts and handicrafts, seemed to his untutored mind little short of miraculous; but the crowning touch was put to his admiration and delight when the harmonium was played in his presence.

From a piece of wood (he exclaimed, enraptured) you produce the most exquisite voices, sweeter than those of birds or men!

And he finally summed up his impressions by saying:—

We are ignorant creatures; we know nothing; we are even as the beasts. Teach us what we ought to do. Come yourself into our country, and instruct us in all those matters you have mentioned. I urge on my cow and my camel; I drive them to the right, and they go to the right; I wish to have my horse and my goat on the left, and I

send them to the left. I order my slave to lead the oxen, my female slave to draw water, and they do it. In like manner, show to us the way we ought to take, and we will obey you like servants and slaves. You shall make us understand exactly what you will. We, our wives, sons, slaves, and servants, our cows, oxen, goats, and sheep, our lands and houses, goods and chattels, even the very leaves on the trees, shall be at your service. We will be your sons, servants, and slaves, and you shall be the father and master of us all.

The invitation so enthusiastically given, was afterwards acted on, and this visit of the chief prepared the way for the mission, which in March, 1875, was sent to Delen, his residence, under the charge of Father Louis Bonomi. In the following September, Monsignor Comboni in person started for a sojourn in the newly established station, and gives the following interesting account of his arrival, in a letter published in the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith":—

After a march of five days, we met, in the midst of the forest of Singiokae, an Arab cavalier, of the race of Omour. I gave him an old *couffie* (a piece of silk used as a covering for the head), and charged him to go and apprise the great chief of the Noubas and the missionaries, of my near approach. In hope of a still better reward, he spurred on his horse, and sped to Delen.

On the evening of the 21st September, 1875, I was extremely surprised to find at half a day's journey from the station of Delen, the great chief of the Noubas coming to meet me, followed by fifty Noubas, armed with firearms and lances. He had scarcely seen me when he dismounted, approached my camel, kissed my hand, saluted me profoundly several times, and said to me in good Arabic, in the dialect of Kordofan: "God has sent you amongst us; and behold, we, our little children, our wives, our young daughters, our oxen, cows, sheep and goats, our houses and lands, all are now placed at your disposal. You are our father, and we are your children; we will do all you command us, and we shall be happy."

"I have indeed come," I replied, "to be your father. In learning all that the missionaries and nuns will teach you, you will prove the best of sons, and be happy, both on earth and in heaven."

I brought the camel to its knees, and, aided by the Cogiour Cacoun, I dismounted.

It was a mild night, brilliant with moonlight and myriads of stars. We spread our mattresses, and the supper having been served on a carpet spread on the ground, we ate joyfully, and drank water, which was brought to us by the Noubas. We bivouacked in company with these good natives, around the fires they had kindled both for the purpose of warming us and to keep off the wild beasts.

Having given the great chief Cacoun a woollen coverlet of the value of five francs, I asked him the next day if he had slept well. He replied joyfully: "How could any one fail to sleep well under the care of God, and with this beautiful coverlet which you gave me yesterday evening,

I am going to put it on my horse, and it will be very useful to me at my residence."

I mounted on horseback. At midday we entered into the *zariba* (enclosure) of the mission, amid the sound of firearms, and cries of joy from the chiefs and the people. We were received by Father Louis Bonomi, Superior of the Mission, and his companions. Several Gnoumas came to visit me.

The Gnoumas are a ferocious people, of tall stature, who wear no clothing. They massacre the Mussulmans and Giallabas who come here to carry them off for the purpose of selling them as slaves. The visits of many other Noubas from the neighbouring mountains gave me great hope of evangelizing this country, where I find that Islamism is greatly detested. But a number of superstitions, rites, ceremonies, and extravagant beliefs, reign here at present, under the influence of a spirit called Ocourou.

The country of Delen is inhabited by more than 50,000 souls. It is situated between 11° and 12° of N. latitude, and 26° and 28° of E. longitude (meridian of Paris). It is the basis of the link of communication, and, as it were, the first great staple of our apostolic undertaking among the people of the great family of the Noubas, which stretches out by the mountains to the south-west. From Delen one may reach in two days the most distant point in the semicircle formed by those mountains. The most thickly populated localities are Gnouma, Sobein, Golfan, Carco, Fonda, hid at a distance of from four to ten hours' journey.

The Noubas are supposed to be descendants of the ancient Christians of Nubia, who fled into Kordofan before repeated invasions of the Arabs from the shores of the Red Sea, the two most formidable of which took place in the seventh and fourteenth centuries. Christianity existed in Ethiopia, which included Nubia, from the fourth century, or even earlier; but in 449, Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, adopted and introduced the Eutychian heresy, the origin of the present Coptic or Jacobite sect. The Noubas are therefore the heirs of one of the primitive churches, disinherited and for ages back cut off from the fold of Christendom, to which our missionaries are now trying to lead them back.

Monsignor Comboni describes them as a peaceable and orderly though indolent people, living in settled dwellings, and attached to their homes. The Cogiour Cacoun, pontiff and king, is an absolute ruler, but generally takes the advice of a Council of elders on all business of importance. Their warriors are brave in battle, and frequently possess themselves of the arms and ammunition of the neighbouring tribes, but at the time the mission was established they were very anxious for a fresh supply of powder and ball, as their stock had run so low that they were sometimes reduced to charge their weapons with pebbles. Their language,

which is distinct from Arabic, has several dialects, like most of those spoken in Central Africa.

The prosperous beginning of the infant mission was soon interrupted by a series of misfortunes. Fever, that terrible scourge of all African exploration, was the first foe by which it was attacked. In the October after its establishment all its members were simultaneously stricken down, and while Monsignor Comboni was meditating a temporary removal, he received intelligence which hastened his movements. It came in the form of a dispatch from the Mudir or governor of Kordofan, residing at Birch, three days' journey off, warning the missionaries to abandon Delen, as it was in danger of an attack from a tribe of wandering Bagaras, and begging them to make use of the 20 camels sent by the writer, to transport themselves and their effects to a place of safety.

The real state of the case, however, as the Superioress learned from the messenger, was that the threatened danger came from the Mudir himself, who, as the Nouba chief had not paid his tribute, had collected a force of 1,000 soldiers and four guns, and was preparing to attack him. Monsignor Comboni, on this information, sent for the Cacoun, and begged him to pay the tribute as usual, but the chief declared it to be impossible, and requested Monsignor to intercede, by sending a letter to the Governor, asking for a delay until after the harvest. This he did, but meantime judged it prudent to start, leaving the property of the mission in charge of the friendly chief.

The journey of the little caravan was a difficult and a dangerous one, as the way lay for fourteen hours through a forest infested by wild beasts. Here, being delayed by the illness of one of the Fathers, who was unable to proceed without rest, they were overtaken by night, and had to sleep on the ground, without provisions or water, and disturbed by the roaring of the fierce denizens of the jungle. At dawn they were able to continue their route, but finding the villages on the way abandoned by their inhabitants, who had fled to escape the exactions of the advancing troops, they had to go on to El Obeid, five or six days' journey from their starting-point.

These temporary troubles having passed away, and peace being restored, the Fathers and their associates returned to occupy the mission-house at Delen, where they set diligently to work to learn the language and compose a little catechism in it, a task of no small difficulty, as it necessitated the reduction to writing of a purely oral language. They are much respected by the people, who say of them, "these are men who do not covet other people's goods;" the highest praise in their eyes, as the other white men they had seen came amongst them only to enrich themselves at their expense. They listen willingly to

instructions, and are all the better disposed to Christianity, as they are described as having little or no attachment to their own religion. Their priests are mere impostors, who practise on the credulity of the people, and are little regarded by them, as seems generally to be the case with idolatrous races among whom Mahometanism has penetrated. The presence of a higher form of belief, as is the most degraded form of monotheism compared with mere fetichism, insensibly undermines the old creed, even in the minds of those who do not adopt the new. Thus the Noubas at the present moment appear to have adopted a sort of Broad Church attitude of latitudinarian indifferentism, and are sometimes willing to have recourse to the Arab priests in preference to their own, and equally ready to accept some practices of Christian devotion. The claim to the possession of a divinely inspired volume gives a religion a certain sanctity or respectability in their eyes, and both the Bible and Koran are regarded by them with reverence. But to produce a profound impression on minds in this condition of tolerant scepticism must necessarily be a work of time, and M. Losi, one of the missionaries at Delen, thus expressed himself in a letter published in *Les Missions Catholiques* on the 26th of December, 1879:—

Despite these excellent dispositions, we do not as yet flatter ourselves with having made numerous conversions. These people are steeped in the most profound ignorance, and it will be necessary to instruct them and lead them from theory to practice. Thanks to our new catechism, we have some consoling results to show, and we shall at least have the rising generation. We are the more led to believe so, as superstition, already shaken, has just received a terrible shock in the following fashion:—

It is customary here to constitute all authority according to the inspiration supposed to reside in the brain of the great Cogiour (chief priest). This year, when the election of a new Sultan, or civil chief of the country, was impending, the Cogiour brought a man from our mountain to teach him the tricks of sleight-of-hand, and wonderful feats of activity, that might make him pass for a creature in direct communication with the Spirit. After having kept him a fortnight in his hut, he proclaimed him Sultan; the Spirit had so willed. All seemed to go well, and the new chief had already opened a shop for the retail of his oracles, when suddenly Hassan Pasha arrived with a mission to combat all those who are carrying on the slave trade. He inquired into the state of the country, and learned that a Sultan had just been elected; he refused to acknowledge him, as being only a creature of the Cogiour, deposed him, and nominated in his place another Sultan, on whom he conferred letters of legalization in due form. The people were enchanted at the change, celebrated his accession to power with great festivities, and seemed little scandalized at the election having taken place without the intervention of the Spirit.

This new functionary, who seemed well disposed towards the missionaries, came in State the day after his installation to pay them a visit, promised them his protection within and beyond his territory, and offered to have his son taught by them, that he might be able to read the Bible and explain it to him. Thus, even in the most remote and savage districts, the Central African Missions, enjoying the protection of the authorities and the sympathy of the natives, seemed to open with a fair promise of prosperity. They, were, however, destined to go through a severe ordeal when the scene of their labours was stricken with one of those dreadful periodical visitations to which tropical countries are especially liable, and the Fathers had to undergo that most painful trial of charitable hearts, in witnessing distress they could do little to alleviate.

Nubia and Kordofan, cut off, as we have seen, from communication with the outer world by a zone of burning desert, are entirely dependent on the production of their own soil for the sustenance of their inhabitants, and a season of unusual drought was followed, in 1878-79, by a total failure of the crops, and the ravages of a terrible famine throughout the country. Monsignor Comboni, writing from Khartoum on the 2nd of January, 1879,* says that to the south, east, and west of that city, over a territory three times the extent of France, death had carried off more than half the population, that Khartoum itself had lost, by emigration or death, a third of its inhabitants, and that several of the neighbouring villages and towns were utterly depopulated. In visiting more than a hundred of these hamlets in the direction of Berber, in order to distribute the alms sent him by the charitable in Europe, he found that the camels, cattle, and even the very dogs, had perished; while the few remaining inhabitants were but living skeletons, supporting a miserable existence on herbs and grass seeds. At Khartoum, corn, which sold five years previously at five thalers the ardeb, had risen to twenty-eight, and in Kordofan was not to be had at any price; so that for seven months no bread had been eaten in the missionary establishments. Four months before an effort had been made to send them some flour, the Vicar Apostolic having purchased twenty sacks at an exorbitant price for the three stations in Kordofan, but no exertions could procure the means of transport for it, as all the camels had perished, and it had to remain finally at Khartoum. Famine was as usual followed by fever and epidemic, and the missionaries suffered many losses not easily replaced. During the month of October, 1878, Monsignor Comboni himself represented the whole available strength of the mission at Khartoum; but at last, worn out

* "*Les Missions Catholiques*," 28 Fevrier, 1879.

by fatigue and anxiety, was stricken likewise with the malady which had prostrated all his subordinates. A letter of the Italian explorer, Signor Pellegrino Matteucci, written from Zoulah, Abyssinia, 2nd of January, 1879, and published in the *Osservatore Romano* of the 8th of February, gives the following interesting details of the sufferings of the mission :—

It is now a year since I wrote a letter from Khartoum, enlarging on the importance of the Catholic Missions. Now, since that date, of all the missionaries at Khartoum, there remain only two or three with Monsignor Daniel Comboni. From Cairo to Massowah, each of my stages has been marked by the intelligence of some fresh misfortune that has stricken the Missions of Central Africa.

The climate of Khartoum is fatal to Europeans; the fevers that prevail there being of so pernicious a type as to carry off the most robust at the second attack. This year the fatal effects of the climate have surpassed all that we had previously heard of it. It seems that the rains this year have been much more abundant than usual, and that centres of contagion have multiplied throughout these vast and desolate plains. Scarcely any portion of the Soudan has escaped the scourge; in many places the very animals have perished.

I have in my hands a letter of Monsignor Comboni's, dated the 28th November. This letter bears the impress of profound sadness. It is plainly to be seen that it is written by an energetic man, almost overborne by the weight of tribulations. He struggles and resists, but twenty years spent in Africa in striving against gigantic difficulties have exhausted the vigour of his youth. Last October his episcopal dignity gave him only the privilege of being the doctor, the infirmarian, and the grave-digger, not alone of his missionaries, but of all who died beneath the shadow of the Cross.

In consequence of the loss of almost all his missionaries, Monsignor Comboni has to defer the accomplishment of his vast projects. Within these last months he had inaugurated, on the route of the Blue River, at Gadaref, an agricultural station destined for a great future. He had prepared the formation of a station at Fascioda or Denab, the capital of the Shillouks, in one of the most barbarous and unhealthy districts of Central Africa. A short time ago he was making all the necessary dispositions for an expedition to the equatorial lakes, which would have reckoned amongst his most important enterprises. For these great designs, the required staff, and perhaps the pecuniary means, are no longer at his disposal. New recruits will arrive; but they can only advance by slow degrees along this road, marked by so many deaths among their predecessors.

The year 1878 must be counted among the most mournful for the Vicariate of Monsignor Comboni. The Soudan has been desolated by a terrible famine. The negroes dropped from inanition on the public highway, or, dying of hunger, dragged themselves to the Mission to beg a handful of dourah, which they were sure to receive. At this period (10th of June, 1878) water was sold at a higher price in Kordofan

than wine in Paris; notwithstanding which Monsignor Comboni congratulated himself in my presence on having left himself without resources, and on having even contracted debts, in order to alleviate the extreme distress of the famishing population. My illustrious friend had good cause to esteem himself happy. To men of faith and devotion like his, the want of material resources has never seemed a disaster; but the most cruel trial for his heart, as bishop, father, and friend, has been the loss of his companions, the ministers of his designs. . . .

Had the missionaries who died last October been simple travellers, the newspapers and learned societies would have spoken of them; but in Europe, the merit of the African missionary is not done justice to, nor the importance of his work appreciated. Explorers know their worth; we travellers can estimate the moral and material effect of the presence of the priest in the midst of savages.

Stanley, the greatest of living explorers, affirms in the narrative of his wonderful journey, that a prolonged residence of missionaries among the tribes dwelling between the Equator and the Congo, would be required in order to prepare them for civilization; since missionaries are the most dexterous and patient pioneers of civilization. Monsignor Comboni is aware of this declaration of Stanley's; and I am sure he meditates acting on it, proposing next year to send new missionaries to establish a station at the Equator. I hope this great design may be accomplished, to the honour of the Italian name, which, gloriously borne by the missionaries, will be regarded as the propagator of civilization in the last retreat of African barbarism.

In the midst of all these discouragements, Monsignor Comboni did not lose sight of his great object of sending forward the standard-bearers of the Cross to occupy fresh points of his vast spiritual domain. Accordingly, in July, 1879, he despatched to the remote station of Gadaref, to provide for the necessities of its forsaken Christians, Father Gennaro Martini, who in an interesting letter to his superiors in Verona describes his journey thither, and his work while there.*

In the midst of the rainy season he started on camel-back, accompanied only by two negro boys (his destined colleague had died of typhus some days before), and passed through decimated villages, whose few surviving inhabitants, torpid and emaciated, sat crouching on the thresholds of their huts, with barely sufficient consciousness to extend their hands for food as the traveller passed. Comuin, formerly a prosperous settlement on the left bank of the river A-zar, had completely changed its aspect. Its inhabitants were industrious peasants, who, after the rainy season, had always sown grain in some portion of the neighbouring desert, obtaining abundance of corn to carry for sale to Khartoum; herds of cows and sheep grazed

* "Les Missions Catholiques," 19 and 26 Mars, 1880.

around it, and every week a considerable market was held there. Now, with the recent drought, all these signs of abundance had disappeared; no flocks or cattle were to be seen; a portion had been killed to satisfy the demands of hunger, and the remainder driven off to distant forests to seek a scanty pasture beneath the trees.

The missionary, repairing to the river at break of day, to renew his supply of water, saw the current swarming with famishing wretches, who dived and swam in all directions in search of some particles of nourishment brought down by the stream. Father Martini distributed some handfuls of corn amongst them, and divided the contents of a can of condensed milk among the starving infants, whose mothers crowded round him for a share of this precious boon, while he took advantage of the occasion to baptize five of the little creatures who seemed near the end of their sufferings.

The journey, as may be imagined, proved a laborious one; camels could scarcely be had at the stations for the transport of provisions; and the party, overtaken at one time on a vast plain by a tropical storm of rain and wind, had to pass the night without shelter, on ground rapidly turning into a morass. Eventually, however, the Father reached Gadaref, where his arrival was hailed with joy by the scattered community of Christians, long deprived of the ministrations of a priest. He organized a little chapel, which was filled to overflowing; and had just opened a school for the boys, with great prospect of success, when an unfortunate outbreak of small-pox, introduced by merchants from Sennaar and Abou-harras, obliged him to close it again.

The ravages of the epidemic, however, served to show the devotion of Christian charity in contrast to the selfishness of the Mussulman population, amongst whom, when a member of a family was attacked with the disease, he was immediately carried to a neighbouring mountain, and deposited in a straw hut, under the care of some old slave, to die or recover as fate might ordain. These huts soon formed a miserable village of the dead and dying, whose sufferings the good Father sought to alleviate, insinuating spiritual teaching, where it was possible, among these outcasts of humanity.

After a stay of five months, finding that the death of the other missionary, who was to have joined him at Gadaref, rendered the permanent occupation of the station for the present impracticable, he started to return to Khartoum, promising his flock to come back as soon as possible to build a church, and establish an agricultural colony in their midst. Gadaref is, in his opinion, well suited for such a purpose, as he considers it the

most healthy spot visited by him in Africa, both from its elevated situation and the dryness of its soil. Typhoid and pernicious fevers, the scourge of the neighbouring districts of Khartoum and Taca, are almost unknown there, and the milder forms of fever which prevail during the rainy season, are not dangerous, and are easily counteracted by the use of bitters, or even such a simple remedy as coffee with a little lemon-juice.

The settlement of his neophytes in these agricultural colonies, so as to form the nucleus of Christian villages, is the main feature of Monsignor Comboni's plan of operations throughout his Vicariate, and his principal hope of success for the future. The children educated in the Christian schools can thus be preserved from growing up amid the deteriorating influences of Mahometanism or idolatry, and retained more directly under the supervision of their pastors. Such a settlement has been formed in the plain of Malbes, in Kordofan, and Geref, near Khartoum, answers the same purpose. Religious instruction alone avails little for the negro, unless accompanied by the teaching of some form of practical industry, so as to train him to the settled habits of civilized life. The establishment organized by the French Fathers at Bagamayo, on this principle, is held up by Commander Cameron as a model for all efforts towards the regeneration of Africa, and the Catholic missionaries have sometimes been congratulated by English travellers on teaching their pupils something besides psalm-singing.

It is, then, on the rising generation that missionaries in all parts of Africa rest their hopes of the future evangelization of the continent, for the fixed habits of a life of degradation render the mind of the adult savage almost inaccessible to the higher truths of religion. The work must necessarily be slow, and its progress perhaps to our eyes scarcely perceptible, since the dire inheritance of ages of barbarism cannot be shaken off in a single generation. But those who work for futurity have time for their partner, and the Church, in whose growth centuries count as years, can afford to be patient, as she is immortal.

Nor should those who sow the seed be discouraged, even if they do not see the harvest.

At any moment a great apostle may be raised up for Africa, to whose voice such persuasive virtue shall be given, as to roll one great wave of conviction from end to end of the Dark Continent, and thrill with an electric message of light all its millions of benighted hearts. Such a one may be destined to appear only after many generations, or is perhaps even now in our midst, preparing, all unconsciously, for his task. His appointed time may be in the remote future, or swiftly coming and close at hand, but when it comes, be it soon or late, those who now toil

amid many discouragements, and with little visible result, will surely know that their life's work was not in vain, while they prepared his way before him, and made straight for him a highway in the desert.

ART. IX.—THE RUSSIAN CHURCH; ITS HISTORY
AND PRESENT ORGANIZATION.

IN a former article* we explained the origin of the Greek schism and its present condition in Turkey. This schism has now more adherents in the dominions of the Tzar and among the Slav races than it has within the Patriarchate of Constantinople. And we must here take note that the schismatic Christians of Greece, Bulgaria, and Roumania† have withdrawn themselves from the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. We purpose in the present article to complete our former sketch by presenting to our readers the origin, history, and actual condition of the Greek schism among the Slavs and the Russians.

1. *Origin of Christianity among the Slavs and the Russians.*

When speaking of Photius we referred to the conversion of the Bulgarians and to the early vicissitudes of their Church, which, although belonging to the Province of Illyria and thereby to the Roman centre, adopted nevertheless the ritual and discipline of the Greek Church.

It is generally known that the conversion of the Slavs was effected through the preaching of the two brothers Cyril and Methodius, and that it is to these two holy bishops that they owe their faith and their liturgy. To give a sketch of their apostolic labours is now no difficult task, for Leo XIII. in his admirable encyclical letter of the 30th of September, 1880, addressed to the archbishops and bishops of the whole world, has given a full account of them. We cannot do better than borrow the words of the Vicar of Jesus Christ :—

Cyril and Methodius, brothers, born in the famous city of Thessalonica, went early to Constantinople in order to study human science in the chief city of the East. The spark of genius that had already appeared in these young men could not long remain unobserved; they both advanced with great strides in the path of learning; but Cyril,

* DUBLIN REVIEW, July, 1880, p. 22.

† The so-called Greek Orthodox Church of Roumania is now "Autocephalous:" it possesses a primate, an archbishop, six bishops, and four and a half millions of believers.

especially, became so distinguished, that he won for himself the title of "the Philosopher." Soon after this, Methodius embraced the monastic life, and Cyril, at the instance of the Patriarch Ignatius, was deemed worthy by the Empress Theodora to teach the Christian Faith to the Khazar tribes who dwelt beyond the Chersonesus, and who had petitioned that learned priests might be sent to them from Constantinople. Cyril accepted the mission willingly, and departed for Chersonesus,* where, as many relate, he devoted some time to the study of the language. It was at this juncture that he had the good fortune to discover the relics of St. Clement I., Pope. This courageous martyr was thrown into the sea by order of the Emperor Trajan, and was afterwards buried with the anchor to which he had been fastened. This, together with the ancient tradition, served to identify the holy remains. With this priceless treasure Cyril penetrated into the towns and homesteads of the Khazars, and in a short time, after abolishing divers superstitions he won for Jesus Christ these tribes taught by his word and moved by the Spirit of God. To the new Christian community thus happily founded, Cyril gave an example of disinterestedness and charity by refusing all the presents offered him by the converts, except indeed the slaves, whose liberty he restored to them on condition that they embraced Christianity. He returned soon after to Constantinople, and retired into the monastery of Polychronius, whither Methodius had already betaken himself.

Meanwhile, rumours concerning the great events happening among the Khazars, reached Rastiz, Prince of Moravia. Fired by their example, he negotiated with the Emperor Michael III., for an evangelizing mission to be sent from Constantinople, and his wish was granted. The signal worth of Cyril and Methodius, together with their zeal and devotedness to others, caused their selection for the Moravian mission.

Setting forth, they traversed Bulgaria, already converted to the Faith, and they let slip no opportunity for advancing the interests of religion. On reaching the outskirts of Moravia, they were met by crowds of the inhabitants who had come forth with great ardour and joy to greet them. Without delay the Apostles strove to penetrate their minds with the doctrines of Christianity, and to raise their hopes to heavenly things, and this with so much ardour and with a zeal so full of energy, that in a very little while the Moravian people gave themselves to Jesus Christ.

Much of their success must be attributed to Cyril's knowledge of the Slav tongue, acquired when on his first mission. He had translated the Old and New Testaments into the popular tongue, and the influence of this sacred literature was very considerable. The whole Slav people, therefore, owe much to him who gave them the Christian Faith, and with it the advantages of civilization; for Cyril and Methodius were the inventors of the alphabet which afforded the Slav tongue the signs and means of a written language, and they are even looked upon as having formed the language.

* Taurica Chersonesus, generally called the Crimea, but since its incorporation with Russia now again called Taurica.

The two holy apostles were summoned to Rome by Pope Nicholas I., and the Holy Father goes on to relate the magnificent reception given them in the Holy City by Hadrian II. who had just succeeded Hadrian I. He then says :

Cyril and Methodius now rendered an account to the Sovereign Pontiff, in the midst of his clergy, of the apostolic mission they had fulfilled with so much labour and holiness, and as they were accused of having acted in opposition to ancient customs, and contrary to the most holy rites, in making use of the Slav tongue for the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, they pleaded their cause with such exact reasoning, based on such authentic facts, that the Pope and all the clergy praised and approved their acts. Both then took an oath, and swore that they would hold by the faith of the Blessed Peter and of the Roman Pontiff, after which they were created and consecrated Bishops by Hadrian himself, and many of their disciples were raised to different grades in "Holy Orders."

Cyril died at Rome, February 14, 869, at the age of forty-two, and Methodius returned as Bishop, to Moravia. But he was soon sent into exile by Prince Swentopolsk, the successor of Ratz, whom Methodius had excommunicated on account of his cruelty and wickedness. Recalled within a short time, his exhortations resulted in the conversion of this Prince.

That which is most admirable, Leo XIII. goes on to say, is that the vigilant charity of Methodius, which had overstepped the borders of Moravia during the lifetime of Cyril, reaching the Liburnians and the Serbs, now embraced the Pannonians, whose Prince he converted to Christianity, and held within the bonds of duty, and the Bulgarians, whom with their Prince Boris, he confirmed in the Faith, and the Dalmatians to whom he dispensed the gifts of heaven, and the Carinthians, for whom he worked strenuously that they might be brought to the knowledge and the worship of the one true God.

But all this zeal became a source of trial to Methodius, for some members of the new community of Christians jealous of his courage and virtue, accused him, in spite of his innocence, to John VIII., the successor of Hadrian, as being of unsound faith, and of violating the traditions of the Fathers, who, in the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, made use of the Latin or Greek tongues to the exclusion of every other. Then the Sovereign Pontiff, zealous for the preservation of the integrity of the Faith and for the maintenance of ancient tradition, summoned Methodius to Rome, and bade him justify himself. Methodius, ever ready to obey, and strong in the testimony of a good conscience, appeared before Pope John, several bishops, and the Roman clergy, in 880. He gained an easy victory by proving that he himself had always kept, and had taught to others, the Faith which, in the presence of Hadrian, and with his approval, he had professed and sworn to keep with oath on the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles ; and if he had made use of the Slav tongue in the Holy Mysteries, he

had done so for good reasons, and with the special license of Pope Hadrian himself, Holy Scripture itself not forbidding it. Methodius justified himself so completely from all shadow of fault, that the Pontiff embraced him there and then, and confirmed his archiepiscopal jurisdiction and his mission to the Slavs.

Methodius returned to Moravia vested with full authority, and accompanied by several Bishops who were to be his coadjutors. Soon, with the assistance of a priest, he converted Borzivoy, Prince of Bohemia, and shortly after, Ludmilla, his wife. Through his labours, Christianity was, before long, spread throughout the land. At the same time he caused the Faith to be carried into Poland, where he himself founded the See of Leopold, in Galicia.

Thence, continues Leo XIII., he is said by some to have penetrated into Muscovy proper, and to have established there the Episcopal See of Kiew. Having thus crowned himself with imperishable laurels, he returned into Moravia to his own people. Feeling his end draw nigh, he named his successor, and having by his last words exhorted his clergy and people to the practice of virtue, he, in great peace, departed this life, which for him had been the path to heaven.

As Rome mourned for Cyril, so did Moravia lament the loss of Methodius, testifying its grief by giving all honour to his burial.

The Holy Father thus concludes :

Venerable brethren, the memory of these events causes Us deep joy, and We cannot contemplate without emotion the magnificent unity, in times so far back, of the Slav nation with the Roman Church. For though the two Apostles of the Christian Faith whom We have just spoken of went from Constantinople to preach to the infidel, it was from this Apostolic See, the centre of Catholic unity, they had to receive the investiture of their mission, or, as happened more than once, its solemn approbation. In truth, it was here, in this city of Rome, that they rendered an account of their mission, and that they answered their accusers; it was here, at the tomb of Peter and Paul, that they swore to keep the Catholic Faith, that they received the episcopal consecration, with the power to found the sacred hierarchy, observing therein the distinctiveness of each order. Lastly, it was here that they solicited and obtained permission to make use of the Slav tongue in the sacred rites, and this year ten centuries have elapsed since the Sovereign Pontiff, John VIII., wrote to Swentopolk, Prince of Moravia: "It is but right we should praise the Slav tongue . . . which re-echoes with the praises due to God, and we ordain that in that same tongue, the praises and the works of our Lord Jesus Christ should likewise be celebrated. And nothing either in the true faith, or in doctrine, forbids that the Mass should be sung in the Slav tongue, or that the holy gospel or the divine lessons of the New and Old Testament, rightly translated and interpreted, should be read therein, or that the Divine Hours should be chanted therein." This custom,

after many vicissitudes, was sanctioned by Benedict XIV., in his Apostolic Brief of August 25, 1754.

Notwithstanding that St. Cyril had evangelized the Khazars, and that St. Methodius, according to trustworthy testimony, had carried the Faith to Kiew, the bulk of the Russian nation remained buried in Paganism till nearly a century later. In the treaty* concluded between the Russians and the Greeks, in 907, Prince Ouleg and his warriors swore on their arms, by Perun, their chief god, and Woloss, the god of their armies, that they would keep it. Yet Christianity was spreading. A treaty concluded forty years later, in 945, gives evidence of this. In it Prince Igor solemnly confirms the agreement in presence of the Greek deputation at Kiew, the capital of his States; the Pagan Russians laying their arms and shields before the statue of Perun, the Christian Russians taking solemn oath in the church of St. Elias. Igor, nevertheless, remained a Pagan, but after his death his wife, Olga, whilst on a visit to Constantinople in 957, embraced Christianity, and received baptism from the hands of the holy patriarch, Polyeuct, together with several of her suite. She returned to Kiew to make known her faith. "Harbinger of Christianity," says Nestor, "she was like the morning-star which goes before the sun, like the dawn which precedes the day. She shone like the moon on a dark night, like a diamond in the mire."

Christianity was only finally established under her grandson, the Grand Duke Wladimir, who was baptised at Cherson in 988, by the Bishop of that city, and who took the name of Basil. Thence he returned to Kiew, and ordered that the statues of the false gods should be everywhere destroyed, and cast into the flames. Soon a proclamation was issued inviting all the inhabitants, rich and poor, lords and slaves, to meet on the banks of the Dnieper, there to receive baptism, under penalty of being declared enemies of the Prince. On the day appointed, the Grand Duke appeared in the midst of the assembled people, surrounded by a brilliant *cortège*. At a given signal all entered the stream to receive baptism. Nestor has left us a touching description of this solemn festival, which heaven and earth, he exclaims with enthusiasm, joined together to celebrate. "The tallest," he says, "plunged into the stream up to their neck, the others up to the breast, the youngest stood at the edge, mothers held their babes in their arms, whilst the priests, seated in boats, recited the baptismal prayers. Wladimir kneeling on the bank, prayed: 'Great God,' he said, 'Lord of heaven and earth, cast

* Nestor, the father of Russian history, mentions this treaty in his "Annals."

a look of compassion on Thy people, bless Thy new-born children, enlighten them that they may know Thee to be the true God, whom the Christians adore. Confirm their hearts in faith. I place my trust in Thee, and with Thy help I shall prove victorious in the warfare with hell.'” Wladimir introduced Christianity into other parts of his empire, founded a city named after himself, built churches, established priests in them, and founded schools.

It is therefore erroneous to state that Russia received the Faith from the schismatic Greek Church of Constantinople. It is quite true that Photius boasts, in one of his letters, of having sent a bishop and priest into Russia, but we have seen that the two apostles of the Slavs, Saints Cyril and Methodius, though Greeks, had received their faculties from the Holy See, and cannot be counted among the schismatics. The Khazars evangelized by St. Cyril, and the other Russian tribes converted by St. Methodius, were not schismatics. When the Princess Olga and the Grand Duke Wladimir, together with their subjects embraced Christianity, the See of Constantinople was occupied by Patriarchs living in communion with the Roman Church, and acknowledging her supremacy. The Patriarch Nicholas Chrysoberg, like his predecessors, Anthony, Basil, Polyeuct, was always in communion with the Holy See. Now it was Nicholas Chrysoberg who governed the Church of Constantinople when Wladimir and his people embraced Christianity.

The Russians having received their first bishops and priests from Constantinople naturally followed the ritual of the Greek Church taught them by their pastors. A further reason for their so doing was, that the beautiful liturgy and the Holy Scriptures had long since been translated into the Slav tongue. This indicates no tendency to schism, especially when we reflect that the Holy See had formally authorised these rites, and the use of the vulgar tongue. It is not surprising, therefore, that the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors should be so often and so distinctly made profession of in the liturgical office of the Russian Church. This office dates from the time when the Russian Church and the Greek Church had not fallen into schism. *Should Russia return to Catholic unity, she would have nothing to change in her liturgy, which for the people at large makes up their religion; she would only have to amend the errors which have crept into it.

The principal See of the Russian Church was established first at Kiew, which bore the title of Metropolitan. Historical details

* See C. Tondini, “La Primauté de S. Pierre prouvée par les titres que lui donne l’Eglise Russe dans sa liturgie.” Paris, 1867.

concerning the first prelates who occupied this See are neither precise nor well authenticated. In 1051, whilst Michael Cerularius was planning his schism, we find the Russian bishops, assembled in synod by the Grand Duke Jaroslav I., electing the devout monk Hilarion as metropolitan of Kiew, and this without intervention on the part of the Church of Constantinople. Although George, the successor of Hilarion was sent from Constantinople, we find no trace of schism during his episcopate (1072-1082). We have even a positive proof to the contrary in the following fact. The Grand Duke Demetrius, or Isaslau, son of Jaroslav, having sent his son to Rome to place his kingdom under the protection of the Holy See, Pope Gregory VII. sent him legates, and wrote a letter to him dated April 17, 1075, which is still extant.* This is a palpable proof that the Russian Church was still orthodox, although the schism of Michael Cerularius had been consummated twenty years before. This same Patriarch introduced into the Russian Church the feast of the translation of St. Nicholas, instituted by Urban II., and which was rejected by the Greek Church.† At the end of the next century we again find the Metropolitan, John (1170), appealing to Pope Alexander III. in a dispute, and soliciting, in the name of all the Russian bishops, the Papal decision. Later still, Alexander, son of Jaroslav II., after defeating the Swedes on the banks of Neva, in 1241, returned to the communion of the Roman Church, as testified by a letter written to this Prince by Innocent IV.

2. *The Russian Church becomes schismatic.*

As the Metropolitan See of Kiew had been made dependent on the Patriarchate of Constantinople, the custom of receiving the Primates of the Russian Church from Constantinople could not but result in drawing her into schism. The Prelates chosen by the schismatic Patriarchs would naturally keep up friendly relations with their patrons. Born in schism, accustomed in the monastic schools to hear the Latins, their ritual, their canonical discipline, their creed, railed against, how could they be free from the taint of schism? Thus, at the beginning of the twelfth century, Nicephorus (1104-1121), sent from Constantinople as Primate of the Church at Kiew, avowed himself a schismatic. This is proved from an Encyclical written by him against the Latins. His successors down to John, mentioned above, followed the

* See Gregorii VII. Registrum, II., 74, in Jaffe, "Monumenta Gregoriana."

† See Nilles, "Kalendarium utriusque Ecclesiæ Orientalis et Occidentalis." Cœniponte, 1879, p. 156.

impulse given by the Byzantine patriarchate. In proportion as the Greeks withdrew more and more from the Latins, the spirit of schism took deeper root in the Russian Church, and her clergy soon fell completely under the power of the Grand Dukes just as the clergy of Constantinople had fallen under the yoke of the Byzantine emperors.

The taking of Constantinople by the Latins, and the antipathy then confirmed between the Greeks and the Latins, contributed not a little to strengthen the Eastern schism. This event was felt in Russia, whose clergy, as we have said, were chosen by the Patriarch of Constantinople. On the invasion of the Tartars, which occurred soon after, the churches, convents, schools, were reduced to ruins; the Russian clergy were plunged into the darkness of ignorance, and the separation from Rome was rendered more complete.

We cannot here follow all the vicissitudes which befell the Russian Church from now till the end of the sixteenth century.

We must, however, note, that several attempts at re-union, both partial and general, were made, the success of which was more or less durable. It will be sufficient to mention the union concluded at the Council of Florence, in 1439, by Isidore, Metropolitan of Kiev and of all the Russias. If the Grand Dukes of Moscow and their people remained obstinately in schism, the Metropolitan See of Kiev, together with eight bishoprics of the Southern Provinces, remained in union with Rome till 1520, when they again fell away into schism.

Several bishops of Northern Provinces wished to imitate the example set them by the Primate of Kiev, but persecution stayed their endeavours. On the other hand, the preaching of the Dominicans and the Franciscans, much esteemed by the Tartar Khans and by the Princes of Lithuania, and above all, the conversion of Jagellon, who in his own person united the crowns of Poland and Lithuania, served to increase the body of Catholics belonging to the Latin rite in the Russian and Lithuanian Provinces.

3. *Patriarchate of Moscow.—Nikon.—The Rascolniks.—The Starovertzi.*

The taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, weakened in a remarkable way the power and the prestige of the Byzantine Patriarchs. The Tzars took occasion thence to subject the Primates of Moscow to themselves, and to free them from all foreign dependence. This was accomplished in 1589 by the erection of the Russian Patriarchate of Moscow. Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople, having come to Moscow to collect

alms for his destitute and ruined Church, was welcomed by the Tzar, who loaded him with presents, obtaining in return the creation of a Russian Patriarchate at Moscow. The Metropolitan Job was raised to the dignity of Patriarch.

The consecration of the Prelate elect was celebrated with great pomp in the Church of the Assumption at the Kremlin. A great number of bishops were present. The ceremony over, the Tzar hung the *Panagion* suspended from a chain of gold round the neck of the new Patriarch, clothed him in a rich mantle or *homophora*, placed on his head a white mitre, ornamented with a cross, and placed in his hand the Patriarchal staff, saying : " Most holy Father, most worthy Patriarch, Father of Fathers, first Bishop and Patriarch of all Russia, of Wladimir, of Moscow, &c., I command that thou shouldst have, and I tell thee that thou hast pre-eminence over all bishops ; that henceforth thou art to wear the patriarchal robe, the bishop's cap and the grand mitre. That throughout my kingdom thou shalt be honoured as a Patriarch and as the brother of Patriarchs." The dignity thus established was confirmed by a decree regulating the rights and the duties of the new Patriarch.

One reads therein, amongst other matters, that : Ancient Rome having fallen into the heresy of Apollonaris, and that the new Rome (Constantinople) being in the power of the Turks, Moscow has become the third Rome ; that in the place of the Prince of Lies, who presides over the Western Church, the first œcumenical Bishop is the Patriarch of Constantinople, the second he of Alexandria, the third he of Moscow, the fourth he of Antioch, the fifth he of Jerusalem. That in Russia, prayer should be made for the Greek Patriarchs, and in Greece for the Russian Patriarchs ; that these last henceforth till the end of time shall be elected and consecrated without need of the consent of the Patriarch of Constantinople. From that moment the Russian Church became purely national, and made itself independent of that of Constantinople ; but in accordance with the invariable fate of all national churches, the Tzars were more potent to impose their own will on the Church. The sole guarantee of independence now held by the Russian Church lay in the firmness of its pastors and chiefly of its Primate, the Patriarch of Moscow.

The Patriarchate founded by one Tzar, lasted rather more than a century, when it was abolished by another Tzar, Peter the Great. This is not the place to discuss the conduct of the Pontiffs who in succession filled the Patriarchal chair, but we must say a word about Nikon, who exercised the Patriarchal jurisdiction from 1652 until his deposition in 1666. From the time when Christianity was introduced into Russia, the old liturgical books translated into the Slav tongue by St. Cyril had been in use.

In the course of time many errors, due to the negligence of copyists, had crept into them. To remedy this, Nikon, with the permission of the Tzar, in 1654 convoked a numerous synod at Moscow, when he proposed that the sacred Scriptures and the other liturgical books should be revised according to the ancient Greek and Slav manuscripts. The synod adopted the proposal, and the revision was undertaken under the direction of Nikon. Notwithstanding the deposition of this prelate (in 1666), the synod met at Moscow in the following year, 1667, approved the corrections introduced by Nikon, had the work completed, and the liturgy was adjusted and made of obligation.

Then arose violent discussions; fanatical partisans of the old books and ancient rites inveighed against the falsification of the old Faith and changing of old customs, which they proclaimed to be heresy and schism; they cursed and anathematized Nikon and his partisans, that is to say, all the adherents of the dominant Church. Their immovable tenacity to old customs and their opposition to the reforms of Nikon won for them the name of Starovertzi or "Old Believers." They are also designated by the more general name of Rascolniks, that is to say schismatics. But it should be remarked that the appellation Rascolniks is much wider than that of Starovertzi. Under the name of Rascolniks are comprised all the sects within the Russian Church, however diverse.

The Rascolniks are generally divided into Bopovzi or Starovertzi and Bespopovzi according to whether they admit or deny the divine ordination of priests and the sacerdotal hierarchy. Those sects which have preserved the priesthood are styled Popovstchina; the principal ones are six in number. The sects which have rejected the priesthood and are known under the collective name of Bespopovstchina (without priests) are much more numerous, and are reckoned at fifty.

According to the Ecclesiastical Canon of Peter the Great every Christian is bound to go to confession and to receive Holy Communion once a year. If he omits to fulfil this duty for one or two years he is classed among the Rascolniks, unless he can justify himself on oath,* and he is to be denounced to the civil authorities. Although the laws relating to the Rascolniks have undergone many changes since the time of Peter the Great, this Article still remains in force. Official lists are drawn up of those who have not complied with the obligation of yearly confession and communion. From these lists, which are often defective, the Government computes the number of Rascolniks. They have been the victims of Draconian laws and of atrocious persecutions

* See Tondini, "*Le Règlement Eccles. de Pierre-le-Grand*," pp. 188, 189.

during two centuries, and yet the sect is still numerous in Russia. Mr. Schedo-Ferroti, whose researches on this subject have been most precise, estimated them in 1863 at nine millions.*

The laws relating to that branch of the Rascolniks called the Starovertzi or "Old Believers" have been greatly relaxed. A sort of compromise has been made between them and the State Church. The Holy Synod, or to speak more plainly, the Tzar, has at last consented to allow them their books and their ritual; he has even provided for the reprinting of the books with the same mistakes as in the time of the Patriarchs. Those who have accepted this compromise are styled "United Starovertzi." The "Dissenting Starovertzi" have obtained a bishop of their sect, who is the Metropolitan of Bela Krinitza in Boukovina, who can consecrate other bishops and who holds jurisdiction over all the Starovertzi in Russia. The real cause of the schism of the Starovertzi, if sought, will no doubt be found in the encroachments made by the civil on the religious authority, in the subjection of the Church to the State; but there are secondary causes, which, apparently trivial, have in reality contributed greatly towards strengthening the schism. Such are the duplication of the Alleluia in certain portions of the Divine Office; the sign of the cross made with two fingers, the writing of the Holy name Jesus "Isus" and not "Jisus" (Ιῆσους); the cross with eight arms instead of four; the custom of processions walking from east to west following the sun's course, &c., &c.

To these causes must be added another, which to our readers may seem very foolish, but which, Tondini tells us, contributed strongly to the increase of Rascolnikism; this was the violent persistency with which Peter the Great insisted on the abolition of beards among the Russians. The first Ukase concerning this matter is dated the 16th of January 1705. In 1707 Peter printed a dissertation compiled by the celebrated Dmitri, Metropolitan of Rostoff, on the "Image and likeness of God in man," with the aim of proving against the Rascolniks, that to shave was not the grievous sin they considered it, and that in losing his beard a man did not lose the image and likeness of God. Dissertations were vain; a tax on beards, enormous in that age, and a thousand petty persecutions on the part of Peter the Great, resulted in creating a new class of martyrs indigenous to Russia, the martyrs of the beard!†

* Schedo-Ferroti, "La Tolérance et le Schisme en Russie," ch. viii. Berlin, 1863.

† Tondini, *opere citato*, p. 189, note.

The Holy Synod. Canon of Peter the Great.

As long as the Patriarchate of Moscow—their own creation—lasted, the Tzars encroached ever more and more on the spiritual power until they held it in complete subjection. This bondage, so skilfully planned, and favoured as it was by the ignorance and disorderly lives of the clergy, was consummated by Peter the Great in his Ukase of January 21, 1721, wherein he arrogated to himself the right and duty of reforming the Church as he had reformed the State; and he replaced the Patriarchate, purposely left vacant after the death of Hadrian (1700) by a permanent Synod chosen by himself, and quite submissive to the royal pleasure. If Peter did not yet assume the title of “Head of the Church” as was soon done by Catherine II. and Paul I., he enjoyed all the prerogatives attached to this title. Moreover, in his “Ecclesiastical Canon” he styles himself “the *guardian* of Orthodoxy,” and of all that concerns right order in Holy Church. The Ukase, just mentioned, runs thus :

We, Peter the First, by the grace of God, Tzar and Autocrat of all the Russias, &c., &c. In the midst of the many solitudes that the authority received from God imposes on us for the improvement of our people and of the other kingdoms under our rule, our attention has likewise been given to the ecclesiastical state; and having remarked therein many disorders and great faults, our conscience has made us fear, and this with great reason, to appear ungrateful towards the Most High, if, after being so powerfully aided by Him in the reform of the military and civil states, we neglected that of the religious state. And we fear to stand without excuse before God when this Judge, who hath no regard to persons, shall demand an account of the so great charge he hath given unto us. Therefore, after the example of pious kings, whether under the old or new law, we have taken upon ourselves to reform the ecclesiastical state. Now finding no better means to accomplish this than a “Council” (for power vested in the hands of a single person has no safeguard against passion, and when the power is not hereditary is held in less account), we therefore institute the “Ecclesiastical College,” that is to say, an ecclesiastical governing Council which, according to the Canon herewith given, shall administer all ecclesiastical matters in the Church of all the Russias. We command all our loyal subjects of every rank, clergy and laity, to recognize this Council as having authority and power, and to have recourse to it in final appeals for every application, solution and decision, in affairs ecclesiastical; to accept its judgment and to obey its decrees in all things, under the same penalties incurred by those who resist or disobey the other Colleges.

This College shall in time complete its “Canon” by such new rules as circumstances may require. Nevertheless, the College shall not do so *without our consent*. . . . We decree that this Ecclesiastical College

shall be composed of ten members as mentioned herein—viz., a President, two Vice-presidents, four Councillors and four Assessors.*

The composition of the Holy Synod has varied according to the good pleasure of the Tzars. This is only natural. Peter the Great was able to modify that which he himself had created, and his successors in like manner have thought themselves equally entitled to make changes in an institution wholly dependent on the civil power. At its beginning the Holy Synod counted but few bishops amongst its members ; at the present time, all with the exception of two are bishops, and belong to what is called the "Black Clergy." The two members belonging to the secular, or "White Clergy," are the Emperor's confessor, the Abbé Bazanov, who is a secular priest and is married, and the grand chaplain of the Army and Fleet, the Abbé Rogdestvenski, who is likewise a secular. The President is Mgr. Isidor, the Metropolitan of Novgorod, St. Petersburg and Finland. The members are :—Mgrs. Philotheos, Metropolitan of Kiev and Gallicia ; Makairios, Metropolitan of Moscow ; Joannikins, Exarch of Georgia, and Eusebius, Archbishop of Mokilew.

The oath imposed on the members of the Synod from Peter the Great down to the present time, contains a phrase which in itself is alone sufficient to prove the complete bondage of the Russian Church. We give it here. "Moreover, I profess with oath that the supreme judge of this Ecclesiastical College is the monarch of all the Russias, our most gracious Sovereign." The members of the first Synod had to humble themselves so far as to promise obedience to the Tzarina Catherine whom the Tzar had married in defiance of the Canons, his legitimate wife being still alive.† As though their bondage was not yet complete, Peter decreed that one of his confidential officials should be attached to the Synod as "Procurator in chief," "to be as it were his eye and the advocate of state affairs." The Tzar's instructions are : "That the Procurator should keep careful watch over the Synod, that it fulfils its duties, and that the affairs confided to its inspection and decision be treated according to the statutes and the Ukases, according to truth, with order, zeal, and without loss of time."

Peter I. was not satisfied with substituting a permanent Synod, which he calls "the most Holy Synod," or elsewhere, "the most

* See Tondini, "Le Règlement," &c., *jam cit.*, pp. 1-5.

† Eudoxia Lapouckhin, whom Peter had married in 1689, was still alive, yet in 1711 he publicly espoused Catherine without alleging any cause which could nullify his first marriage. The Greek Church admits divorce in cases of adultery, but Peter did not put forward that reason. Besides, no ecclesiastical decision ever intervened to declare the marriage void. The conduct of Peter recalls that of Henry VIII.

Holy directing Synod," for the Patriarchate; he himself drew up, with the aid of the celebrated Theophanes Procopovitch, created by him Bishop of Pskow, a Canon for the reform of the Russian Church, which he imposed as law in the Ukase we have just cited. As this Canon, though considerably modified by the successors of Peter the Great, remains to this day the basis of the organization of the Russian Church, it is necessary to indicate its principal points.

It is divided into three parts. The first treats of the Synod, and of the reasons necessitating its creation; the second treats of matters in general relating to the Church, and of special points concerning the clergy, the monks, the schools, the laity; the third refers to the members of the Synod and their functions. Then follow, as a supplement, the rules of conduct imposed by Peter on the secular clergy, on the monks and the nuns; a complete ecclesiastical code. In many points the rules laid down in this new code are only the expression of the canonical laws received by the Greek Church, but in other and important ones the ancient Canons are trodden under foot. Thus, provincial Synods are abolished, and the hierarchical order of Patriarchs, Metropolitans and Bishops is suppressed. In the Russian Church there is only the order of bishops; the title of Archbishop or of Metropolitan is merely honorary and lucrative. All the bishops are under the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod. The election and the nomination of bishops are no longer regulated by the Canon of the Greek Church. The Tzar names the bishops on the presentation by the Synod of two names. The nuns cannot take their vows till they have reached the age of sixty. A later Ukase fixes the age of religious profession at forty. Up to that age virgins who enter the cloisters are only novices. These are not the only innovations which the Tzar has taken the liberty to introduce, as we shall see in the course of our analysis.

We have shown the object of the first part. In the second the Tzar turns his attention to various prayers in the Divine Office, forbids certain superstitious practices peculiar to Russia, and orders the revision of the "Lives of the Saints."

The ordinances relating to the instruction of the people deserve special notice. The "Canon" admits that ignorance was great among the faithful, and even among the clergy in the preceding century—(the state of things is much the same now).

Seeing (it goes on to say) there are few men who can read and that there are not many priests capable of teaching by word of mouth the dogmas and the precepts of Holy Scripture, it is absolutely necessary that short treatises, easy and comprehensive, should be compiled for simple people, containing all things needful for the

instruction of the faithful, and that portions of them should be read in the church to the congregation on Sundays and Festivals.*

It is necessary, therefore, that three books should be composed ; these must be short and of small size.

The first shall contain those dogmas of our Faith which are most necessary for salvation,† and also the commandments of God contained in the Decalogue.

The second shall explain the duties of each state of life.

The third shall be a collection of sermons easy of comprehension and taken from the Holy Doctors, relating to the principal dogmas, and more especially to virtues and vices and also to the special duties proper to every state of life.

On Sundays and Festivals, at Matins, a portion of the first book shall first be read, and the second lesson shall be taken from the second book. At Mass on the same day a discourse taken from the third book shall be read, the subject to be the same as was treated of in the two lessons *read at Matins*. In this wise the instruction conveyed at Matins being again repeated at Mass, will become more firmly fixed in the memory of the hearers.‡

The first of the little books here prescribed was compiled by Theophanes Procopovitch, and was published a year before the Canon was promulgated. It is called "Peter the Great's Catechism."§ Phillips brought out a translation in London in 1723 called "The Russian Catechism, composed and published by order of the Tzar." Father Tondini remarks that in many points it is more Protestant than the Book of Common Prayer. The second book was not compiled till much later, by Tikhov, Bishop of Voronegi (+ 1783), recently canonised by the Russian Church. After revision, the Holy Synod adopted and published it in 1789. Lastly, the third book, the joint work of the Metropolitans of Moscow and St. Petersburg, was published at St. Petersburg in 1779, and was made obligatory by the Holy Synod in all the churches of the towns, of the country, and even of the monasteries. The Holy Synod, however, took occasion to invite the clergy to compose their own sermons, giving it to be

* The Canon decrees that these books should be "written in the vulgar tongue," that is to say in Russian. Up to this period Slavonic was the language of the learned.

† These principal dogmas recall to mind the "fundamental dogmas" of the Protestants. Peter the Great's Canon breathes in more than one place the Protestantism with which Theophanes Procopovitch had become tainted.

‡ See Tondini, "Le Règlement," *jam cit.*, pp. 46-52.

§ Before this time the Russian Church used the catechism or exposition of the orthodox faith of Peter of Mojila (+ 1646) the founder of the Ecclesiastical Academy of Kiev. This catechism had been approved by the Council of Jassy in 1643, and that of Jerusalem in 1672.

understood that the collection of discourses had for sole aim to supplement their own short-comings.*

Referring to special subjects, the Canon treats first of the duties of bishops; the first of which is, it considers, to know the impediments of marriage. The impediments of consanguinity and affinity are the same as in the Greek Church, and are taken from the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus. There are other impediments fixed by the Canons or by the regulations of the Tzars. Thus, according to the Canons, men may not enter into the married state before the age of fifteen, and women before the age of thirteen; but a Ukase of the Emperor Nicholas has fixed eighteen as the age for men and fifteen for women. The Russian Church, like the Greek, allows divorce in cases of adultery. Furthermore, it allows of a second marriage after a lapse of five years in the event of the disappearance of one of the parties, if during that time no tidings can be obtained of them. The *civil* death of one of the parties also annuls marriage. It is therefore clear that the Tzars have arrogated to themselves a really spiritual jurisdiction over marriage.

The first duty of bishops, according to the Canon, then, is to know the impediments of marriage. Peter the Great goes on to order that the rules which concern them should be read to the bishops at their meals. This reading may be omitted on great festivals, and on some other occasions here specified. Bishops are to adhere to the laws of residence in their strictest sense. They are to have within their residences or adjoining thereunto, a school for the children of priests and others who are destined for the Ecclesiastical state. None but the students at these schools are to be promoted to the priesthood. Farther on the Canon ordains that there shall also be seminaries organized after a completely monastic fashion, where the discipline is to be of the strictest, in which youths destined for the priesthood shall be educated together with such as are preparing for the liberal professions. Such of the seminarists as, on the completion of their studies, seem most suited for the ecclesiastical state, shall be promoted by the bishops to all the degrees of the hierarchy in preference to any others who shall not have been educated at the seminary.

Peter concludes the ordinances relating to bishops by saying that they are not to take pride to themselves in their dignity.

* Monsignor Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, published in 1825, "A Detailed Catechism of the Orthodox Church," for the use of schools. A second and corrected edition appeared in 1839. His sermons have been collected and edited, and are held in great esteem. Monsignor Makairios, the present Metropolitan of Moscow, has published an "Orthodox Dogmatic Theology," which is in great repute.

The aim of this declaration is not, as might be imagined, to inculcate evangelical humility, but rather submission to the Tzars, for it is in their regard that the bishops are to restrain their pride. Bishops must therefore be circumspect and forbearing in the matter of excommunication. Peter regulates every step in the procedure of this penalty, which is not to be launched against any of the faithful without the written authorization of the Holy Synod.

We will not here give the ordinances of the Canon which relate to the "Academy," for the reference here is not to the "Ecclesiastical Academy" of St. Petersburg, which was erected later on with that of Kasan by Paul I., in 1797, nor to the two Ecclesiastical Academies at Kiew and Moscow, already in existence. The rules laid down for the seminaries have since been greatly modified.

The Canon then proceeds to treat of preachers, and lays down these strange rules. "No one shall take upon himself to preach unless he has been educated at the Academy, and is approved of by the Ecclesiastical College (Holy Synod)." Nevertheless, those who have pursued their studies under *heterodox* teachers, that is to say, Protestants, may also, after passing an examination, be allowed to preach. "Every preacher must possess a copy of the works of St. John Chrysostom, and must read them assiduously. As to authors whose works are superficial and quibbling, as are specially the Polish writers, he will avoid them." "Sermons should be practical and sound, and preachers must avail themselves of texts from Holy Scripture in favour of penance, amendment of life, respect due to authority, *especially to the supreme authority of the Tzar*, on the duties of every station in life, and against superstitious practices, which must be completely extirpated."

Under no circumstances does the Catholic Church allow the seal of confession to be violated. Confessors are under a grave obligation to keep secret the confidence reposed in them, even should it bring on them the heaviest penalties. This did not suit Peter the Great's views. In the "supplement" he decides that when there is question of a plot against the Tzar, his government, or his family, and that the penitent will not forego his intentions, the confessor must *break the seal of confession*. The same is to be done in the case of a false miracle. One is no longer astonished that the confidence of the confessional has been often violated by the Russian popes.*

The Canon now turns its attention to the simple faithful. These must first learn the orthodox doctrine ; they must also go

* See Gagarin, "Le Clergé Russe." Brussels, 1871, pp. 231, 232.

to confession and communion at least once a year. Parishioners who have not communicated for one or two years, or not at all, must be denounced to the bishop by their parish priest. They must declare on oath that they are not Rascolniks, otherwise the bishop is obliged to *inform the civil authorities*, who will prosecute them on the ground of their being Rascolniks. Père Gagarin, who is thoroughly conversant with Russian customs, observes that notwithstanding the stringent laws which oblige all Russians to go to confession every year, it is rare that more than half the number of persons of age to fulfil the precept of the paschal observance present themselves at the tribunal of penance, sometimes only one-fourth, sometimes even one-tenth. To go to confession more than once a year is almost an unheard of thing in the village parishes.*

Lastly, no gentleman can have a chapel in his house, or a private chaplain. All the faithful, without exception, must attend the parish church. No oratory can be erected in Russia without the permission of the Synod, a permission not easily obtained."†

The third section of the Canon is taken up with the Holy Synod, its functions and its duties. The Holy Synod must know in detail the obligations of each state of life, and must punish transgressors. No book treating of religious matters can be published without the *imprimatur* of the Holy Synod. Religious works having greatly increased in the present day, four committees, styled "Ecclesiastical Censorships," have been established and attached to the four Ecclesiastical Academies of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiew, and Kasan. These committees transmit the result of their criticism to the Holy Synod, and with its assent they grant the *imprimatur*. The Holy Synod can of itself authorize publications.

The authentication of miracles, the decision as to whether a person is or is not a Rascolnik, difficult conscience cases, doubtful marriages, disputes between bishops and their clergy, in a word, all those matters formerly appertaining to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch are now the province of the Synod. The inspection and superintendence in chief of church property has also devolved on the Synod.

Lastly, Peter desires the Synod to frame some regulations in respect to mendicity. He is incensed at such as beg through idleness; they are, he considers, the worst of scoundrels. Those who give them alms share in their sin, and are themselves guilty. With this decision of exaggerated sternness against the poor, Peter concludes his Canon, which remains as we have said the

* Gagarin, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

† See Tondini, "Le Règlement," *jam cit.*, p. 199.

basis of Ecclesiastical discipline in the Russian Church. The Canon was signed by Peter and by the bishops he had gathered round him in a sort of Synod. It was afterwards communicated to the different "Eparchies," to be signed by the Bishops and the Archimandrites of monasteries, which was done. Finally the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople recognized the Holy Synod in a letter of September 23rd, 1723.

PRESENT STATE OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

The Russian Church constitutes the largest branch of the Greek schismatic Church. It is now, as we have seen, completely separated from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and only maintains with it a communion of belief and of liturgical rites. The Tzar is the head of the Russian Church. With him lies the choice of the members of the Synod, and their dismissal. The government of the Church is entirely in his hands, and he can do everything but officiate.* Paul I. was the first to declare in formal terms that "the supreme authority granted by God to the Autocrat extends also to the ecclesiastical state, and that the clergy must render obedience to the Tzar *as to their head chosen by God Himself in all matters, religious and civil.*"† According to the laws of the Russian empire the Emperor, in virtue of being a Christian sovereign, is the supreme defender and protector of the dominant creed, the guardian of orthodoxy, and of all that concerns good order in the Holy Church.‡ Next to the Tzar comes the Holy Synod, which has the charge of all matters, whether spiritual or temporal, relating to the Orthodox Church.

Holy Synod. The Holy Synod is held at St. Petersburg. The Metropolitans and Bishops who compose it are dispensed from the obligation of residence in their diocese, and live always at St. Petersburg, except those bishops who are summoned to the Holy Synod as "assistants" for a specified time. Their functions fulfilled, these latter return to their eparchies. Besides the stipend attached to their respective positions, the members of the Synod receive an annual payment, the bishops of 2,000 roubles,§ the archimandrites of 1,000 roubles, and the archpriests of 600 roubles. As all the members of the Holy Synod are bishops, it follows

* Theophanes Procopovitch, the favourite of Peter the Great, declared "that the Tzars had received from on High the power to govern the Church; but they might not officiate."

† Ukasses Nos. 18,734 and 19,684; see Tondini, p. 14. "*L'Avenir de l'Eglise Russe.*" Paris, 1874.

‡ "Code of Laws of the Russian Empire." Fundamental Laws, a. 42, ed. 1847, p. 10. Tondini, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

§ The value of a silver rouble is about three shillings of English money.

that they belong to the regular clergy. The only exceptions are the Emperor's confessor, and the grand chaplain to the army and fleet, who belong to the secular clergy, and are married. The Synod counts a certain number of lay functionaries, whose influence on the decisions of the assembly is something considerable. In the first place there is the "Procurator-in-Chief," the representative of the Emperor, who keeps watch over all the proceedings of the Synod. He has the direction of the Exchequer of the Synod, and of the numerous attendants employed by it. Besides the Exchequer, the Holy Synod has a section for the superintendence of the schools for the orthodox clergy, and an accountant and administrative section under the direction of a State Councillor.

The present members of the Holy Synod are :*

President : Isidor, Metropolitan of Novgorod, St. Petersburg, and Finland.

Members : Philotheos, Metropolitan of Kiew and Gallicia; Makairios, Metropolitan of Moscow and Colomna; Joannikins, Exarch of Georgia, Archbishop of Kartalini and Kakhetia; Eusebius, Archbishop of Mohilew and Mstislaw; Protopresbyter Bazanof; Archpriest Rozdestvenski.

Procurator-in-chief ; Privy Councillor Pobedonosstzew, Minister of Public Instruction. *Assessor* : Privy Councillor Smirnow.

Chancery-Director : Privy Councillor Vochtehinine. *Vice-Director* : State Councillor Pavlovski.

Director of Schools for the Education of the Orthodox Clergy (Academies and Seminaries) : T. Vassilien.

Department of Administration and Accounts—Director : State Councillor Iliinski. *Vice-Director* : State Councillor Ostroumow.

Archbishoprics and Bishoprics. As we have already observed, there is no longer any real distinction in the Russian Church between the Metropolitans, Archbishops, and Bishops ; the title of Metropolitan or Archbishop is purely honorary, and carries no special jurisdiction over the bishops of a province ; it constitutes a difference of salary without imposing any bond of subordination. As celibacy is requisite in a bishop, it follows that all the bishops belong to the monastic state, styled in popular language the "black clergy," the monk's habit being of that colour. In contradistinction, the parochial clergy composed of married priests is called the "white clergy." Great antagonism exists between these two sections of the clergy. The black clergy alone are eligible for the episcopate, and this gives them a great advantage over the white clergy.

Revenue. Since Catherine II. by a Ukase of February 26,

* According to the Gotha Almanac, 1881.

1764, confiscated all Church property and suppressed a great many convents, the bishops and clergy have received stipends from Government—a very slight compensation for their lost property. These stipends vary much. Thus, the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg receives 5,414 roubles, he of Kiew, 4,900; the Archbishops of Riga, Taurida, Staveropol, Lithuania, Mohilef, and Minsk, each 4,000 roubles; he of Cherson, 2,414 roubles; twelve others 914 roubles. There are some bishops who only receive 743 roubles. These bishops, besides their stipend, receive an allowance to defray the expenses of their cathedral and household, varying between 1,000 and 3,000 roubles. The Synod moreover owns capital to the amount of 254,543 roubles, the revenue of which is distributed among the bishops as a subsidy. To this we must add what may be termed “casual moneys,” that is to say the proceeds of ordinations, burials, church consecrations, offerings made in the episcopal chapels, offerings made to miraculous pictures, of which a portion has to be set aside for the bishop. Lastly, as the bishops are monks, and as they continue to follow the monastic rule, they generally select for their Archiepiscopal palace one of the numerous monasteries suppressed by Catherine II., and they enjoy the revenue still belonging to them, which consists of land, mills, and fisheries of some value. The bishop is in a way the archimandrite of his monastery; he lives like the monks, though his table is better served, separate from the rest, and all his personal suite live in community as do the monks. The household of the episcopal palace is composed of two archpriests who are monks, a confessor, a steward, three deacons, and attendants who vary in number and are maintained at the bishop’s expense. The Archbishop of St. Petersburg keeps thirteen ecclesiastics, monks or seculars, and fifty-eight other attendants and servants.

Administration. The administration of a diocese belongs to the bishop; the clergy, both regular and secular, are under his jurisdiction. To help him in the administration, the bishop has a “consistory” composed of five, six, or ten members, chosen partly from the Archimandrites and the Hegoumeni of the monasteries, and partly from the secular clergy. The Secretary of this Consistory is a layman chosen by the Holy Synod on the nomination of the Procurator-General. This secretary has under him a host of assistants and clerks, each one more mercenary than his fellow. By right, of course, all authority lies with the bishop, but in real fact it is the secretary and his staff who decide all temporal affairs, often very much to the disadvantage of the clergy.* It must be admitted that the bishop has small liberty

* Russian bureaucracy has a bad reputation for venality; the bureaucracy of the “Consistories” is even more mercenary than any other. A

in the administration of his diocese ; he depends almost entirely on the Russian bureaucracy. The seminaries and the ecclesiastical educational establishments which one would imagine ought especially to be under the jurisdiction of the bishop are dependent on the Synod. All that concerns the discipline and the direction of these houses is withheld from episcopal authority. The new ecclesiastical regulations, however, have now given the bishops the right of presentation in the nomination of the superiors of seminaries.

Residence.—Bishops are ordered to reside in their dioceses. Peter I. and his successors framed laws so stringent on this matter, that bishops could neither meet or hold any verbal communication with each other. It is only lately that Russian bishops have obtained faculties to absent themselves for eight days from their Eparchies after informing the Synod, and for twenty-eight days with previous permission. For any longer absence it is requisite to obtain leave from the Tzar.*

Translations and Depositions.—As the Tzars have reduced the Russian Church to complete subjection, the bishops no longer enjoy much of that stability which the Canons of the Greek Church assigns to them. Thus, translations from one See to another, are of frequent occurrence. Now, by way of promotion and now as a sign of disgrace, Russian bishops are sent from one See to another, as easily as elsewhere the prefect changes his prefecture, and their consent is not asked.† Bishops are deposed without a trial, and often without any canonical cause. The displeasure of the Administration is sufficient reason for a bishop "to be allowed to rest," that is to say he is allowed to retire into a monastery.

Eparchies and Bishops: ‡—1. Kiev: Philotheos, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galicia. 2. Novgorod and St. Petersburg: Isidor, Metropolitan of Novgorod, St. Petersburg and Finland. 3. Moscow: Makairios, Metropolitan of Moscow and Colomna. 4. Kasan: Anthony, Archbishop of Kasan and Iviagsk. 5. Astrakan: Guerasim, Archbishop of Astrakan and Jenotafevsk. 6. Tobolsk: Ephraim, Bishop of Tobolsk and Siberia. 7. Jaroslaw: Jonathan, Bishop of Jaroslaw and Rossow. 8. Pskow:

regular system of extortion, perfectly organized, which racks priests, deacons, and poor clerics, and swallows up all their savings. A hideous cancer which devours the Russian clergy, who if once delivered from these shameful spoliations would find their income quite sufficient.—Gagarin, "Le Clergé Russe," p. 203.

* Tondini, "Le Règlement," p. 60, note.

† Gagarin, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

‡ The Eparchies are taken from the "Gotha Almanac," 1881; the Bishops from Silbernagl: "Verfassung und gegenwärt. Bestand sämmtl. Kirchen des Orients." Landshut, 1865.

Paulus, Bishop of Pskow and Pockhow. 9. Riasan: Polladius, Bishop of Riasan and Saraïsk. 10. Iver: Savva, Archbishop of Iver and Kachina. 11. Kherson: Platow, Archbishop of Kherson and Odessa. 12. Taurida: Gourii, Bishop of Taurida and Simpheropol. 13. Lithuania: Alexander. 14. Warsaw: Leontius, Archbishop of Cholme and Warsaw. 15. Mohilew: Eusebius, Archbishop of Mohilew and Mstislaw. 16. Riga: Philaret, Bishop of Riga and Mitau. 17. Tchernigow: Serapion, Bishop of Tchernigow and Nieshin. 18. Minsk: Eugenius, Bishop of Minsk and Tourovsk. 19. Podolia: Marcellus, Bishop of Podolia and Braclaw. 20. Kichinew: Paulus, Bishop of Kichinew and Khotine. 21. Olonetz: Paladius, Bishop of Olonetz and Petrosawodsk. 22. Region of the Don: Mitrophanes, Archbishop of the Don and of Novolcherkask. 23. Irkoutsk: Benjamin, Archbishop of Irkoutsk and Nertchinsk. 24. Georgia: Joannikins, Exarch of Georgia, Archbishop of Khartalinia and Karkhetia.

To these, Silbernagl adds the Archbishoprics and Bishoprics mentioned below:—

(1) Archbishopric of Jekaterinoslaw. Bishoprics of (2) Raluga and Borovsk; (3) Smolensk and Dorogobusch; (4) Nijni-Novgorod and Arsamas; (5) Kursk and Bjelgorod; (6) Wladimir and Susdal; (7) Polotsk; (8) Wologda and Ustzug; (9) Tula and Bjelew; (10) Vjatka and Slobodskoi; (11) Archangel and Cholmogori; (12) Voroniga and Zadonski; (13) Kostroma and Galitsch; (14) Tambow and Zadsk; (15) Orel and Sievsk; (16) Pultava and Perejaslaw; (17) Volhinia and Zitomir; (18) Perm; (19) Sitka and Kamtchaka; (20) Pensa and Saransk; (21) Saratow and Tsaritsia; (22) Charkow and Ukrain; (23) Orenbourg; (24) Simbirsk; (25) Ostrog; (26) Pinsk; (27) Tomsk; (28) Vilna; (29) Vitebsk. The Exarch of Georgia has under him the Bishops of Gori, Kutais, Imeritien, Mingrelia, and Guriel. Besides the above, the Russians have a Bishop at Jerusalem.

The Secular or White Clergy.—In Russia there are 36,000 parishes. The clergy attached to a parish church regularly consist of a priest or pope, a deacon, and two clerks filling the functions of sacristan, beadle, bell-ringer, lector, cantor, &c. All the popes or parish priests are married, so are the deacons. In the Latin Church, celibacy is obligatory for all who enter Holy Orders. In the East, a less rigorous discipline has prevailed from early times. There, as in the Latin Church, once a man has received Holy Orders he cannot marry, but if a married man presents himself for ordination he is not rejected, and he is allowed to live with his wife, but should she die he cannot marry a second time. In former times, when seminaries did not exist,

and when each parish chose its own pastor, the selection naturally fell, as it does now among the Maronites, on some virtuous father of a family esteemed by all for his morals and piety. He then retired into a monastery to learn the Office, and how to administer the sacraments, after which the Bishop ordained him. Now when there are seminaries in Russia where aspirants for the priesthood are prepared for the ministry, the inconveniences of this custom have become much greater. As the end of their studies draw nigh, and the time of ordination approaches, the young collegians must look about in haste for a wife. To this end they are allowed to attend balls and entertainments, and to act the suitor. The spirit of piety is easily put to flight by these distractions, and the young men newly married are but badly prepared for ordination. Add to this that regulations introduced since Peter I., ordain that all the sons of popes and deacons should be sent to the seminaries to be brought up for the priesthood.* Vocation is simply ignored. As in ancient times all Levites were dedicated to the service of the altar, so now all the sons of the popes are vowed to the priesthood, and they alone can attain to it. The sons of a nobleman, burgher, or peasant, who would wish to be admitted to Holy Orders would meet with insurmountable obstacles unless they entered the monastic state. It is not difficult to understand how such a state of things is apt to introduce a spirit of laxity among the Russian clergy. Besides this plague of "Levitism," which is the ruin of the whole clergy, the marriage state which they adopt must lessen the respect due to them. Without doubt married priests can administer the sacraments of baptism and matrimony, perform the burial service, celebrate Holy Mass, chant the offices of the church, and hear a certain number of confessions, especially at Easter; but absorbed by household cares, by the education and prospects of their children, they cannot bring to the exercise of their holy ministry the same zeal, devotedness, and self-abnegation as do priests who are free from all these impediments. Let us suppose a case: a man is dying of some infectious disease; the celibate priest hastens to him as a soldier to the battle-field; but will the father of a family always have courage to risk the lives of his children? Moreover, the same disinterestedness cannot be looked for in a married priest as in a celibate.†

Although there is no positive law obliging all seminarists to

* A Ukase of Alexander I., published in 1814, orders that all the sons of the clergy should, between the ages of six and eight, be placed at the disposal of the department of Ecclesiastical schools.

† Gagarin, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

marry before receiving Orders, yet are they obliged to do so by custom, and they have not even perfect freedom in choosing their wives. Priests and deacons have daughters, these daughters must be settled in life; thence results a prohibition to the clerics to marry out of their own class. Some bishops will even not tolerate that they should marry any one out of the diocese.

The incomes of the parochial clergy are generally sufficient. The total is 28,000,000 roubles for 36,000 parishes. This includes the offerings of the faithful for baptisms, marriages, confessions, communions, and burials. This sum does not include the perpetual foundations for the dead, or the revenue from landed property attached to the parish church. This last is considerable; even in small parishes the pope has *at least twenty hectares** of glebe land. The collective income is divided thus: the pope receives half, the deacons a quarter, the remaining quarter being divided between the two clerks. Priests are exempt from all taxation. Hence we see the clergy are fairly remunerated, and in towns they may even sometimes afford to live in moderate luxury. The village priest's position is that of one of his well-to-do peasant parishioners. He lives as they do, speaks after their fashion, and is clothed like them; he tills his fields, guides his plough, plants his garden, whilst his wife attends to the house, looks after the children, and knits their stockings. If his status is not higher and more in harmony with his sacred functions, it is not so much because his stipend is small as because he has a family dependent on him, and also because he is often the victim of the venality of Russian underlings. The sacred character of the priesthood, nevertheless, inspires such respect, that should the pope be addicted to drunkenness (no rare thing), his parishioners continue to look up to him with the solicitude and affection of children. The pope chants the Mass and the Sunday office with all the magnificence of the Greek ritual. He never preaches, and indeed strives but little to acquire the capacity needful for so doing, he knows it would not help him to better his condition. He administers the sacraments according to the Greek rites. Baptism is given generally two or three weeks after a child's birth. Immediately after baptism the priest moistens a feather with the holy chrism; and touches the forehead, breast, lips, hands, and feet of the child with it, repeating at each application: "Receive the Seal of the Holy Spirit." This is the manner of administering the sacrament of confirmation in the Russian Church. Ten or twelve days later the child is carried to the altar to receive the Holy Eucharist. The mother mounts the steps in front of the

* A hectare = 2·471 English acres.

royal gates, and when the deacon comes forward holding the chalice, she advances to meet him; with a small spoon he pours a few drops of the Precious Blood into the mouth of the child saying, "N., servant of God, receives this communion in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The marriage ceremonial is very solemn, and the fasts, as in the Greek Church, are very rigorous.

The Monks, or Black Clergy.—From what we have already said, it results that a church possessing only a married priesthood would be very incomplete, but in all Eastern churches by the side of the married clergy is found a celibate clergy; these are the Monks. It is from among them, and only from them, that the bishops are chosen. If the austere lives of the monks and their celibacy cause them to be held in veneration by the people, we may imagine what further importance and authority they acquire by the fact that all the dignities of the church are reserved for them. The monks all follow the rule of St. Basil. Their habit is black; hence their name of the black clergy. Those monks who are raised to the priesthood are called, as in the Greek Church, "*ιερομοναχοι*." From the monasteries are taken the professors and directors of seminaries and academies, the preachers for the large towns, confessors and prelates. The Abbots of the large monasteries are styled Archimandrites, those of the lesser, Hegoumeni. It is noticeable that the monasteries for men are much more numerous than the convents for women. This is accounted for by the edicts of Peter I. and his successors, which have made admission into the convents much more difficult. For instance, a young girl must remain a "Novice" until she attains the age of forty, only then is she allowed to take her vows.

Formerly convents were very numerous in Russia. In 1762, without including Little Russia or White Russia, there were 732 monasteries and 222 convents. The Ukase of Catherine II., confiscating church property, ordered that the number should be reduced to 361 monasteries and 39 convents. This meant the suppression of 544 religious houses. Little by little the rigour of this law had to be relaxed, and the number of religious houses has been gradually increasing. In 1850 there were 464 monasteries, containing 4,978 monks, and 123 convents containing 2,313 nuns. In 1850 the novices or aspirants numbered 6,230. These numbers include the convents of the "United Greeks," who were forcibly incorporated in 1839.

The Russian monasteries are under the jurisdiction of the bishop in whose diocese they are placed. There are, however, a few of the great monasteries which depend directly on the Holy

Synod. These are the four great "Lauras": St. Alexander Nevski at St. Petersburg, the Trinity of St. Sergius at Moscow, the Crypts or Catacombs at Kiev, Potchayew in Volhynia taken from the "United Greeks by the Emperor Nicholas, and the seven "Staupigies": the New-Saviour at Moscow, the Don at Moscow, Simon at Moscow, the Resurrection near Moscow, the Picture of the Saviour at Moscow, Solovetz in the Eparchy of Archangel, St. Jaroslaw at Rostow.

Conclusion.—This short sketch of the state of the Russian Church is sufficient to show that it is now in complete bondage to the temporal power of the Tzars, and this is the principal cause of the misery and abuses which oppress it. And indeed there are many Russian writers of the present day who demand that it should be freed from the civil power, and that its hierarchy and its provincial councils should be re-established in conformity with the Canons. These writers, however, see but one side of the question. Did they push their investigations farther they might perhaps perceive that the real safety of the Russian Church lay in her reunion with the centre of unity—the Roman Church from which she separated herself. United to the See of Rome from which she received Cyril and Methodius, strengthened by the successor of St. Peter, the successor of him who in her liturgy is styled the Coryphæus, the Head, the Chief, the Prince of the Apostles and of the Church, she would reform the abuses under which she languishes, she would preserve her own liturgy and ritual, to which she is so deeply attached, and her own canonical discipline re-established in its primitive purity. She would purify her faith, and profess those dogmas of the procession of the Holy Ghost, "*a Filio*" and of the Supremacy of the Pope which all the Oriental churches admitted before their schism. We will prove that the obstacles said to be presented by these two dogmas proceed really from the sophistries heaped together by Photius and those whom he seduced. Though the Bishops, and at their head the Archbishop of Moscow, Mgr. Makairios, are striving to maintain these two points, the people take but little interest in the matter. They do not sufficiently know their religion, and the ignorance of the populace, and even of the country clergy is too great to allow these questions to stir them. It is not in matters of faith that the difficulty lies. The people care only for their liturgy and their solemn rites, to which they are so deeply attached that the slightest change shocks them; this is proved by the schism of the Starovertzi.

The greatest obstacle lies in the civil authority. The Russian Government allows to all the free practice of their own religion,

but it does not allow the members of what is called the Orthodox Church to embrace any other Confession of faith, and especially to become Catholics. The most severe penalties are incurred by those who are guilty of such a crime. A Russian who embraces Catholicism through a conscientious belief that it is the true faith, or a Catholic priest proved to have caused the conversion of a Russian, is treated like a state criminal. The following are some of the laws of the Russian "Penal Code" published May 1st, 1846.

ART. 195.—Whoever shall seduce any one from the Orthodox Faith to any other profession of Christianity shall be condemned: To forfeit all the rights and privileges of his station and to be exiled to the province of Tobolsk or Tomsk. If he be not exempt by law from corporal punishment he shall receive fifty to sixty strokes of a rod before being sentenced to hard labour for one or two years.

ART. 197.—Any one who by conversation or writing shall have striven to entice away the faithful unto the profession of any other creed, even Christian, shall be condemned . . . here follows an enumeration of the penalties, which go as high as exile and hard labour for a second offence.

ART. 200.—He who is aware that his wife or children, or any one under his charge have the intention to leave the Orthodox Faith, and shall not strive to dissuade them from so doing by taking the measures authorized by the law for this purpose, shall be liable to imprisonment varying from three days to three months, and if he belong to the Orthodox Church he shall be liable to Ecclesiastical penalties.

Happily this barbarous law, compelling a man to denounce even his own wife and children, has remained a dead letter; but for the honour of the nineteenth century it should no longer exist.

ART. 203.—Members of the Catholic clergy secular and regular belonging to Western States, who, though they use no means to convert Orthodox believers, shall permit them to assist at their services in church or monastery, this being expressly forbidden, shall for this transgression pay a fine of ten roubles a head.*

We must, however, hasten to explain that these laws which are such a grievous violation of liberty of conscience, are at the present time much mitigated in their application. Let us hope that the noble-minded Sovereign who has just concluded a pacific arrangement with the wise and benevolent Pontiff now governing the Catholic Church, will make them still more lenient, and even be allowed to repeal them altogether, and to inaugurate for

* See all these laws in the work of Prince Augustin Galitzin: "*L'Eglise Greco-Russe.*" Paris, 1861, pp. 107-113.

Catholics in Russia an era of peace which will cause his name to be blest and will strengthen his Empire, develop its prosperity, and merit the protection of Heaven and the praise of all Europe.

T. J. LAMY.

P.S.—These lines were in type when the horrible assassination plunged the imperial family of Russia in mourning and terrified Europe. The Emperor Alexander II. has fallen a victim to an abominable sect. Alexander III. has succeeded to the throne, and confidence returns; Europe recovers; Russia, for an instant dismayed, regains courage. Let us hope that Alexander III. will continue the good relations with the Holy See that have been commenced by his father. He will always find in his Catholic people, faithful subjects, formed in a school of respect, and brought up in sentiments of horror for assassins and wicked sects.

T. J. L.

ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII.

ON

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE
FAITH, &c. &c.

*Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis Primatibus Archiepiscopis et
Episcopis Universis Catholici Orbis, gratiam et communionem
cum Apostolica Sede habentibus.*

LEO PAPA XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALVTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

SANCTA Dei civitas quae est Ecclesia, cum nullis regionum finibus contineatur, hanc habet vim a Conditore suo inditam, ut in dies magis dilatet locum tentorii sui, et pelles tabernaculorum suorum extendat.* Haec autem christianarum gentium incrementa, quamvis intimo Sancti Spiritus afflatu auxilioque praecipue fiant, extrinsecus tamen hominum opera humanoque more perficiuntur: decet enim sapientiam Dei, eo modo res universas ordinari et ad metam perducere, qui naturae singularum conveniat. Non unum tamen est genus hominum vel officiorum, quorum ope fiat ad hanc terrestrem Sion novorum civium accessio. Nam primae quidem partes eorum sunt, qui praedicant verbum Dei: id exemplis et oraculis suis Christus edocuit; id Paullus Apostolus urgebat iis verbis: *Quomodo credent ei quem non audierunt? quomodo autem audient sine praedicante? . . . Ergo fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi.*† Istud autem munus ad eos pertinet, qui rite sacris initiati fuerint.—His porro operae studique non parum afferunt qui vel auxilia in rebus externis posita suppeditare, vel fusis ad Deum precibus caelestia charismata conciliare solent. Quapropter laudantur in Evangelio mulieres, quae Christo evangelizanti regnum Dei ministrabant de facultatibus suis,‡ et Paullus testatur, iis qui Evangelium annuntiant voluntate Dei concessum esse ut de Evangelio vivant.§ Pari modo assectatores auditoresque suos Christum ita iussisse novimus: *Rogate Dominum messis, ut mittat operarios in messem suam.*|| primosque Eius alumnos, Apostolis praeaeuntibus, ita supplicare Deo consuevisse: *Da servis tuis cum omni fiducia loqui verbum tuum.*¶

Duo haec munia quae in largiendo supplicandoque consistunt, cum perutilia sunt ad regni caelorum fines latius proferendos, tum illud habent proprium, ut ab hominibus cuiuslibet ordinis expleri facile queant. Quis enim est aut tam tenui fortuna, ut exiguum dare stipem, aut tantis rebus occupatus, ut pro nuntiis sacri Evangelii Deum obsecrare aliquandiu prohibeatur? Huiusmodi vero praesidia adhi-

* Is. liv. 2.

† Rom. x. 14, 17.

‡ Luc. viii. 3.

§ 1 Cor. ix. 14.

|| Matth. ix. 38, Luc. x. 2.

¶ Acts iv. 29.

bere semper viri apostolici consueverunt, nominatim Pontifices romani, in quos christianae fidei propagandae maxime incumbit sollicitudo: tametsi non eadem perpetuo ratio fuit haec subsidia comparandi, sed varia et diversa, pro varietate locorum temporumque diversitate.

Cum aetate nostra libeat ardua quaeque coniunctis plurimorum consiliis et viribus aggredi, societates passim coire vidimus, quarum nonnullae etiam ob eam causam sunt initae, ut provehendae in aliquibus regionibus religioni prodessent. Eminent autem inter ceteras pia consociatio ante annos fere sexaginta Lugduni in Galii coalita, quae a *propagatione fidei* nomen accepit. Haec primum illuc spectavit, ut quibusdam in America missionibus opem ferret: mox tamquam granum sinapis in arborem ingentem excrevit, cuius rami late frondescunt, adeoque ad missiones omnes, quae ubique terrarum sunt, actuosam beneficentiam porrigit. Praeclarum hoc institutum celeriter Ecclesiae Pastoribus probatum fuit et luculentis laudum testimoniis honestatum. Romani illud Pontifices Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., Decessores Nostri et commendarunt vehementer et Indulgentiarum donis ditaverunt. Ac multo etiam studiosius fovit, et place caritate paterna complexus est Gregorius XVI., qui in encyclicis litteris die XV. mensis Augusti anno huius saeculi quadragesimo datis in hanc sententiam de eodem loquutus est: "Magnum sane opus et sanctissimum, quod modicis oblationibus et quotidianis precibus a quolibet sodalium ad Deum fusis sustinetur, augetur, invalescit, quodque Apostolicis operariis sustentandis, christianaeque caritatis operibus erga neophytos exercendis, nec non fidelibus ab impetu persecutionum liberandis inductum bonorum omnium admiratione atque amore dignissimum existimamus. Nec sine peculiari divinae providentiae consilio tantum commodi atque utilitatis Ecclesiae nuperrimis hisce temporibus obvenisse censendum est. Dum enim omnigena inferni hostis machinamenta dilectam Christi sponsam lacessunt, nihil illi opportunius contingere poterat, quam ut desiderio propagandae catholicae veritatis Christiani-fideles inflammati iunctis studiis, collataque ope omnes Christo lucrifacere conarentur." Haec prolocutus, Episcopos hortabatur, sedulo agerent in sua quisque Dioecesi, ut tam salutare institutum nova quotidie incrementa caperet.—Neque a vestigiis Decessoris sui deflexit gloriosae recordationis Pius IX., qui nullam praetermisit occasionem iuvandae societatis meritissimae, eiusque prosperitatis in maius provehendae. Revera auctoritate eius ampliora pontificalis indulgentiae privilegia in socios collata sunt, excitata ad eius operis subsidium christianorum pietas, et praestantissimi e sodalium numero, quorum singularia merita constitissent, variis honorum insignibus decorati; demum externa aliquot adiumenta, quae huic instituto accesserant, ab eodem Pontifice ornata laude et amplificata sunt.

Eodem tempore aemulatio pietatis effecit, ut binae aliae societates coalescerent, quarum altera a *sacra Iesu Christi infantia*, altera a *Scholis Orientis* nuncupata est. Priori propositum est tollere et ad christianos mores educere infantes miserrimos, quos desidia vel egestate compulsi parentes inhumaniter exponunt, praesertim in Sinensium regionibus, ubi plus est huius barbaria moris usitata. Illos itaque

peramanter excipit sodalium caritas, pretioque interdum redemptos christianae regenerationis lavacro abluendos curat, ut scilicet vel in Ecclesiae spem, Deo iuvante, adolescant, vel saltem morte occupatis sempiternae felicitatis potiundae facultas praebetur.—Sollicita est de adulescentibus alia quam commemoravimus societas, omnique industria contendit, ut ii sana doctrina imbuantur, studetque prohibere fallacis pericula scientiae, ad quam proni persaepe illi feruntur ob improvidam discendi cupiditatem.—Ceterum utraque sodalitas antiquiori illi, cui a fidei propagatione nomen est, adiutricem operam praebet, et stipe precibusque christianarum gentium sustentata ad idem propositum amico foedere conspirat; omnes enim eo intendunt, ut evangelicae lucis diffusione quamplurimi ab Ecclesia extorres veniant ad agnitionem Dei, Eumque colant, et quem misit Iesum Christum. Meritis proinde laudibus, velut innuimus, haec duo instituta, datis Apostolicis litteris, ornavit Pius IX. Decessor Noster, iisque sacras Indulgentias liberaliter est elargitus.

Itaque cum tria sodalitia tam certa Pontificum maximorum gratia flourerint, cumque opus singula suum studio concordii urgere numquam desierint, uberes edidere salutis fructus, Congregationi Nostrae de propaganda fide haud mediocre attulere subsidium et levamen ad sustinenda missionum onera, atque ita vigere visa sunt, ut laetam quoque spem facerent in posterum segetis amplioris. At vero tempestates plures ac vehementes, quae adversus Ecclesiam excitatae sunt in regionibus iamdudum evangelica luce illustratis, detrimentum intulerunt iis etiam operibus, quae sunt ad barbaras gentes excolendas instituta. Et enim multae causae contiterunt, quae sociorum numerum liberalitatemque minuerent. Et sane cum passim opiniones pravae spargantur in vulgus, per quas mundanae felicitatis appetitio acuitur, caelestium autem bonorum spes abiicitur, quid ab iis expectetur, qui animo ad excogitandas, corpore ad capiendas voluptates utuntur? Huiusmodi homines precesne fundant, quibus exoratus Deus populos sedentes in tenebris ad divinum Evangelii lumen victrici gratia adducat? Istine sacerdotibus pro fide laborantibus ac dimicantibus suppetias ferant? Restrictiores porro fieri ad munificentiam animos etiam piorum hominum temporis improbitate oportuit, partim quod abundante iniquitate refrixit multorum caritas, partim quod rerum privatarum angustiae, publicarum motus (iniecito etiam metu peioris aevi) plures in retinendo tenaces, parciores ad largiendum effecerunt.

Multiplex contra gravisque necessitas Apostolicas missiones premit atque urget, cum sacrorum operariorum copia efficiatur quotidie minor; neque abreptis morte, senio confectis, labore attritis praesto sunt qui succedant pares numero et virtute. Religiosas enim familias, unde plures ad sacras missiones prodibant, insensis legibus dissociatas cernimus, clericos ab aris avulsos et onus militiae subire coactos, bona utriusque Cleri fere ubique publicata et proscripta.—Interim aditu ad alias plagas patefacto quae videbantur imperviae, crescente locorum et gentium notitia, aliae atque aliae quaesitae sunt expeditiones militum Christi, novaeque stationes constitutae: ideoque plures desiderantur, qui se iis missionibus devoveant, et tempestiva conferant subsidia.—Difficultates omittimus et impedimenta a contradictionibus oborta.

Saepe enim viri fallaces, satores errorum, simulant Apostolos Christi, humanisque praesidiis affatim instructi munus catholicorum sacerdotum praeverunt, vel deficientium loco subrepunt, vel posita ex adverso cathedra docentis obsistunt, satis se assequutos rati, si audientibus verbum Dei aliter ab aliis explicari incipitem faciunt salutis viam. Utinam non aliquid artibus suis proficerent! Illud certe defendendum, quod ii vel ipsi, qui tales magistros aut fastidiunt aut prorsus non noverunt, puramque veritatis lucem inhiant, saepe hominem non habeant, a quo sana doctrina erudiantur et ad Ecclesiae sinum invitentur. Vere parvuli petunt panem, et non est qui frangat eis; regiones albae sunt ad messem, et haec quidem multa, operarii autem pauci pauciores forsitan propediem futuri.

Quae cum ita sint, Venerabiles Fratres, Nostri muneris esse ducimus, piis studiis caritativae christianorum admoveere stimulos, ut qua precibus, qua largitionibus sacrarum missionum opus iuvare et fidei propagationi favere contendant. Cuius rei quanta sit praestantia, cum bona ostendunt quae illi proposita sunt, tum quae inde percipiuntur compendia et fructus. Recta enim tendit sanctum hoc opus ad gloriam divini nominis et Christi regnum amplificandum in terris; incredibiliter autem beneficum est iis, qui e vitiorum coeno et umbræ mortis evocantur, et praeterquam quod salutis sempiternae compotes fiunt, ab agresti cultu ferisque moribus ad omnem civilis vitae humanitatem traducuntur. Quin etiam iis ipsis est valde utile ac fructuosum, quorum in eo aliquae sunt partes, cum spirituales illis divitias comparet, praebeat materiam meriti, et Deum quasi beneficii debitorem adstringat.

Vos igitur, Venerabiles Fratres, in partem sollicitudinis Nostrae vocatos etiam atque etiam hortamur, ut concordibus animis apostolicas missiones sedulo vehementerque adjuvare Nobiscum studeatis, fiducia in Deum erecti et nulla difficultate deterriti. Salus agitur animorum, cuius rei causa Redemptor Noster animam suam posuit, et Nos Episcopos et sacerdotes dedit in opus sanctorum, in consummationem corporis sui. Quare retenta licet ea statione gregisque custodia quam cuique Deus commisit, summa ope nitamur, ut sacris missionibus ea praesidia suppetant quae a primordiis Ecclesiae in usu fuisse commemoravimus, scilicet Evangelii praeconium, et piorum hominum cum preces tum eleemosynae.

Si quos ergo noveritis divinae gloriae studiosos et ad sacras expeditiones suscipiendas promptos et idoneos, his addite animos, ut explorata compertaque voluntate Dei, non acquiescant carni et sanguini, sed Spiritus Sancti vocibus obtemperare festinent.—A reliquis autem sacerdotibus, a religiosorum virorum utriusque sexus ordinibus, a cunctis denique fidelibus curae vestrae concreditae magnopere contendite, ut numquam intermissis precibus caeleste auxilium satoribus divini verbi concilient. Deprecatores autem adhibeant Deiparam Virginem, quae valet omnia errorum monstra interimere; purissimum eius Sponsum, quem plures missiones iam sibi praestitem custodemque adsciverant, et nuper Apostolica Sedes universae Ecclesiae Patronum dedit; Apostolorum Principes agmenque totum, unde profecta primum Evangelii praedicatio omni terrarum orbe personuit; ceteros demum

praeclaros sanctitate viros, qui in eodem ministerio absumpsere vires, vel vitam cum sanguine profuderunt.—Precationi supplici eleemosyna accedat, cuius quidem ea vis est, ut vel loco dissitos et alienis curis distentos apostolicorum virorum adiutores, eorumque cum in laborando tum in bene merendo socios efficiat. Tempus quidem est huiusmodi ut plures premat rei familiaris inopia; nemo tamen idcirco animum despondeat: stipis enim, quae in hanc rem desideratur, collatio nulli ferme potest esse gravis, quamvis e multis in unum collatis satis grandia queant parari subsidia. Vobis autem, Venerabiles Fratres, commonentibus, unusquisque consideret, non iacturae sed lucro suam sibi liberalitatem futuram, quia feneratur Domino qui dat indigenti, eaque de caussa ars eleemosyna dicta est omnium artium quaestuosissima. Revera si, ipso Iesu Christo auctore, non perdet mercedem suam qui uni ex minimis eius poculum dederit aquae frigidae, amplissima profecto merces illum manebit, qui insumpto in sacras missiones aere vel exiguo, precibusque adiectis, plura simul et varia caritatis opera exercet, et quod divinorum omnium divinissimum sancti Patres dixerunt, adiutor fit Dei in salutem proximorum.

Certa fiducia nitimur, Venerabiles Fratres, eos omnes qui catholico gloriantur nomine, haec reputantes animo et hortationibus Vestris incensos, minime defuturos huic, quod Nobis tantopere cordi est, pietatis officio; neque passuros studia sua in amplificando Iesu Christi regno, eorum sedulitate et industria vinci, qui dominatum principis tenebrarum propagare nituntur.—Interea piis christianarum gentium coeptis Deum propitium adprecantes, Apostolicam benedictionem, praecipuae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, Clero et populo vigilantiae Vestrae commisso peramanter in Domino impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die III Decembris A. MDCCCLXXX,
Pontificatus Nostri Anno Tertio. LEO PP. XIII.

LETTER OF THE HOLY FATHER

TO

CARDINAL GUIBERT.

*Dilecto Filio Nostro Hippolyto S. R. E. Presbytero Card. Guilert
Archiepiscopo Parisiensi.*

LEO PP. XIII.

DILECTE FILI NOSTER SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

PERLECTAE a Nobis libenter sunt litterae, quas ipse, Dilecte Fili Noster, ad Principem Reipublicae, ad Praefectum consilii publicis negotiis administrandis, nuperrime vero ad Praepositum negotiis Galliae interioribus misisti super decretis die XXIX. mense Martio factis adversus collegia sodalium religiosorum, in quibus non sint, ut fere loquuntur, iura collegiorum legitima. In iis quidem litteris non mediocris est commendatio constantiae tuae cum eximia caritate

coniunctae: propterea quod libere aequae ac placate demonstras, ubicumque est Ecclesiae catholicae libertas constituta, ibi religiosos ordines sponte coalescere: ipsos enim tamquam ex stirpe quadam existere et quasi nasci ex Ecclesia; et perinde esse atque auxiliares copias, his temporibus maxime necessarias, quorum sollicitiam et industriam cum in perfectione munerum sacrorum, tum in hominibus christiana caritate adlevandis peropportune atque utilissime Episcopi adhibeant.—Atque illud quoque scienter inter cetera ostendis, nullum esse rei publicae genus, cui religiosae sodalitates adversentur atque repugnent: non parum autem interesse tranquillitatis publicae, tot civibus innoxii quiete placideque vivendi integram manere facultatem; non esse denique virorum populo bene consulentium, videri velle a religione, quae communis est omnium, discedere, fidemque catholicam ab avis et maioribus hereditate acceptam hostiliter consecrari.

Ceterorum autem Episcoporum Galliae eadem de funestis illis decretis sententia fuit, idemque iudicium. Omnes enim magna cum laude fortitudinis ac moderationes patrocinium ordinum religiosorum publice studioseque susceperunt, in eaque re fungi se officio intellexerunt iusto atque debito; sentiunt enim, id quod res est, impendentium malorum magnitudinem, nec solum Ecclesiae luctum futurum, sed etiam imminentem Galliae calamitatem non levem, liberis civibus iniuriam, publicae tranquillitati discrimen.

Et sane, eximios istos viros, in quorum capita vim placuit acere legum, Ecclesia ipsa et genuit et materna sollicitudine aluit ad decus omne virtutis atque humanitatis. Neque uno tantum nomine plurimum iis debet civilis hominum societas, cum et sanctitate morum ad recte faciendum incitare animos multitudinis consueverint, et doctrinae copia sacras profanasque disciplinas illustrare; demum omnium optimarum artium patrimonium mansuris ingenii sui fructibus locupletare. Et quibus temporibus maior extitit Clericorum penuria, ex coenobiis prodivere sacrorum operariorum manipuli praestanti sapientia et sedulitate, qui adiumento Episcopis essent in excolendis ad pietatem animis, in doctrina evangelica disseminanda, in instituenda ad litteras bonosque mores iuventute. Eorum autem qui ad barbaros populos, Evangelii caussa, mittuntur, maximum numerum semper contulerunt domus sodalium religiosorum in Gallia consistentium; qui magnis pro catholica fide exantlatis laboribus una cum Evangelio christiano Gallorem nomen et gloriam ad dissitas gentes transtulerunt.—Nullum vero in conditione humana prope est infortunii genus, quod non lenire, nullus casus, in quo nomen poni solet calamitatis, cui non sodales religiosi tempestivam admovere medicinam studuerint, in nosocomiis, in domibus infimae plebi recipiundae, in urbium pace et otio, in trepidatione atque aestu tumultuum bellicorum; idque ea suavitate et misericordia, quae non potest nisi a divina caritate proficisci. Cuius caritatis cunctis provinciis, urbibus, oppidis in conspectu sunt nobilissima exempla egregiae fructus.

Tot tantorumque meritorum commendatio, concordii Episcoporum testimonio instructa, satis virium ad intentatam prohibendam cladem habitura videbatur; praesertim cum Galliae cives ex omni ordine longe plurimi, praesenti sacrorum ordinum discrimine commoti, alius

alio studiosius profiteri voluntatem suam, honestissimo certamine obsequii ac benevolentiae, contenderint; neque pauci magistratu abire, publicisque muneribus sese abdicare memorabili exemplo fortitudinis maluerint, quam aut cladis adiutores se praebere, aut illorum decretorum fautores videri, quibus legitimae usuque diuturno receptae civium libertati inferri grave vulnus intelligebant.

Sed ad nobilissimas Episcoporum voces hominumque catholicorum querimonias, male auspicato consilio, clausae aures fuerunt. Imo prudenter coniciebatur sodalitates religiosas non esse interitum evasuras, etiamsi legitima societatum iura petivissent; quoniam non obscuris rerum atque animorum indiciiis satis apparebat, propositum de tollendis sacris ordinibus iam in mentibus insedisse; eamque ob rem decere unanimi sententia censuerunt abstinere precibus; eo magis quod aliae caussae non deessent, quae id ipsum persuaderent.

Itaque ad constitutam diem, vi adhibita, primo illo decreto agi coeptum, quo sanciebatur ut Societas Iesu universa Gallia dissolveretur. —Eius rei causa Legatum Nostrum Parisiis consistentem deferre extemplo iussimus querelas Nostras ad rei publicae administratores, simulque ostendere, nihil esse tale meritis tot spectatae virtutis viros; quorum caritatem, doctrinam, curasque summo studio et perspicaci prudentia in educanda praesertim iuventute collocatas haec Apostolica Sedes sicut diu novit, ita plurimi facit. Atque eorumdem virtuti, et gratia et praeclaro iudicii sui testimonio, Galli suffragantur, cum filios adolescentes, carissima pignora, disciplinae integritatique ipsorum alacres et fiduciae pleni commendare soleant.

Verum cum editae per Legatum Nostrum querelae nihil profecissent, in eo iam eramus ut vocem Nostram apostolicam pro officio et potestate Nostra attolleremus adversus ea quae in sacrorum ordinum perniciem gesta essent, quaeve in posterum gererentur. —Tunc autem significatum Nobis est, posse a decretis ceterum perficiendis desisti, si sodales religiosi, datis in id litteris, declararent, se a motibus commutationibusque rerum publicarum esse alienos, nec vivendo agendoque in studia partium discessisse.

Causae Nobis multae et graves suaserunt, ut conditionem acciperemus ultro ab ipsis imperantibus oblatam, quae praeterquamquod nec doctrinis catholicis esset, nec ordinum religiosorum dignitati contraria, hoc etiam habebat commodi, ut arcere detrimentum permagnum a Gallia, aut saltem eripere ex inimicorum manu quoddam quasi telum posse videretur, quo ipsi saepenumero abuti ad nocendum sodalibus religiosiis consueverant.

Perspectum atque exploratum Nobis et huic Sedi Apostolicae est, quo consilio, cuius rei gratia, sodalitates religiosae sint in Ecclesia catholica constitutae: nimirum ad perfectionem absolutionemque virtutis in sodalibus ipsis progignendam; in actione autem vitae, quae foras eminet, et propria est singularum, nihil esse aliud ipsis propositum, quam aut sempiternam proximorum salutem, aut miseriarum humani generis levamen; quibus rebus student alacritate mirabili, assiduitate quotidiana. —Procul dubio nullam Ecclesia catholica reprehendit aut improbat formam civitatis; et quae ab ipsa Ecclesia ad communem utilitatem instituta sunt, prospere esse possunt, sive unius sive plurium

potestate et iustitia regatur res publica. Sedes autem Apostolica quae, in variis vicibus flexibusque rerum publicarum, negotia expedit necesse est cum iis qui populo praesunt, hoc vult hoc spectat unice, rem christianam salvam esse: laedere vero iura imperii, cuiuscumque tandem ea sint, nec vult, nec velle potest. In rebus autem non iniustis parendum eis esse, qui praesunt, conservandi causa ordinis, in quo est publicae fundamentum incolumitatis, nemo dubitat: nec tamen est consequens, obtemperando approbari si quidquam est aut in constitutione aut in administratione civitatis non iustum.

Cum haec sint iuris publici praecepta catholicorum hominum communia, nihil erat impedimento quominus illa animi declaratio fieret.—Atque idcirco in eo est admiratio nonnulla, quod istud gravissimis momentis ponderatum consilium, et christianae civilisque rei causa susceptum parum aequos existimatores et iudices offenderit viros cetera probabiles, quod in religione catholica defendenda strenue ingenioseque elaborent. Quibus ad rem aequius aestimandam, nosse satis erat, eam, quam diximus, animi declarationem auctoritate, aut hortatu, aut saltem assensu Episcoporum peractam fuisse. Praeesse enim et consulere rebus, quae ad religionem catholicam pertinent, Episcoporum est, quos *Spiritus Sanctus posuit regere Ecclesiam Dei*: ceteros autem subesse et obtemperare oportere perspicuum est.

Igitur ea, quae expetebatur, declaratione proposita, religiosis familiis minus timendum videbatur.—Verumtamen maxime dolendum est gubernatoribus rerum Galliae publicarum pergere placuisse quo instituerant; iamque illinc nuntii Nobis in dies afferuntur acerbi ac tristes; reliquas etiam ordinum religiosorum familias disici atque ad interitum vocari coepisse. Qua quidem nova, quam Gallia iam sentit, pernicie Nos graviter commovemur, vehementerque angimur; atque iniuriam, quae Ecclesiae catholicae infertur, deploramus ac detestamur.

Interea tamen cum saeviat atrociter bellum et acriora haud procul sint e conspectu certamina, Nostri muneris est instituta Ecclesiae ubique conservare invicta stabilitate constantiae, et forti excelsoque animo iura tueri, quae sunt fidei Nostrae commissa.—Quam ad rem omnino confidimus, nec tuam Nobis, Dilecte Fili Noster, nec ceterorum Venerabilium Fratrum operam defuturam, qui obsequentem Nobis animum egregiamque voluntatem modis omnibus testari nunquam intermittunt. Vobis igitur adiuvantibus, illud Deo aspirante consequimur, ut in his temporibus rebusque tam trepidis admirabilis illa coniunctio retineatur, a fide et caritate profecta, qua christianas gentes, Episcopos universos et supremum Ecclesiae Pastorem colligatos inter se esse necesse est.

Hac spe freti Tibi, Dilecte Fili Noster, Venerabilibus Fratribus Episcopis Galliae, Clero populoque curae vestrae concredito, divinatorum munerum auspicem et praecipuae benevolentiae Nostrae testem, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XXII Octobris A. MDCCCLXXX, Pontificatus Nostri Anno Tertio.

LEO PP. XIII.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.

1. *Historisch-politische Blätter.*

TO the January issue I contributed a critique of the five volumes of Father Gams's "Ecclesiastical History of Spain." This learned work was started in 1862, but completed only in 1879; the cause of this delay being not only the publication of the "Series Episcoporum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ," but mainly the fact that Dr. Gams, owing to the liberality of the late King, Maximilian II. of Bavaria, was enabled to go to Spain, there to continue his studies in the Spanish libraries. He also employed his sojourn in Spain for making himself thoroughly acquainted with the liturgy of the Spanish Church, the condition of the hierarchy and clergy, and the position of religion in the public life of the nation. Father Gams extended his studies even to Spanish America; hence students of Church history are greatly indebted to him for those most interesting and instructive notices about that southern America; which otherwise would be for many scholars a *terra incognita*. Besides this, archæologists may profit by his solid researches concerning Spanish inscriptions, the canon law of the Spanish Church, the position of the inhabitants in different periods, and the journeys of St. Paul in Spain. What the reader looks for in vain is the description of the influence of the Arabian philosophy in Spain, the struggles sustained by the Church against those dangerous systems, and the foundation and development of the English and Scotch colleges in that country. But what was, after all, the author's motive in publishing a Spanish Church History on a scale so large that it grew to five bulky volumes? Dr. Gams, in the course of his historical researches, became, as it were, enchanted by Bishop Hosius of Cordova, whose labours for the Church and whose orthodoxy he was then wholly occupied in defending against so many attacks of old and modern writers. The plan and limits of a mere biographical sketch were soon passed, and the work grew to its present bulk. The first volume treats of the introduction of the Christian religion into Spain, and very cogent reasons are adduced for St. Paul's sojourn in that country. It is only by assuming it, that we can fully understand the notice given by St. Clement of Rome of St. Paul's arriving, *ἐπὶ τὸ τέμα της δύσεως*; or bring order into the chronology of the Acts of St. Luke, or account for the various traditions preserved for so many centuries in the Spanish churches, of St. Paul's missionary work in the Peninsula. Dr. Gams lays great stress on the immemorial devotion of the Spanish

Church to St. Thecla, because her cult is inseparably bound up with that of St. Paul.

The second volume deals with the persecutions under the Roman emperors, a topic affording occasion to our author to defend the Christians against the assumptions of those modern Protestant writers who dare to taunt them with disobedience and provocation, whilst they excuse, or even praise, the inhuman measures resorted to by the heathen emperors. For our author it is not difficult to prove that the Emperor Diocletian was urged by the influence of the neo-platonic philosophers to persecute his Christian subjects in Spain as elsewhere. The philosophers had failed to re-establish paganism, and inspired the emperor with their own rage against Christianity. Next the author treats on the victory of Christian religion in Spain, the great dogmatical struggles with Arianism, and the defence of the Catholic faith by Bishop Hosius. Although many divines in the Western Church doubted Hosius' orthodoxy, the liturgy of the Eastern Church recognizes his merits by celebrating his memory on August the 27th, together with Pope Liberius. Whoever wishes to study the Spanish liturgy, or to follow the history of St. James's relics, ought to peruse Father Gams's third volume. He traces the history of the relics from the Emperor Justinian I., in whose reign they came to the convent of Raithu in Palestine, and describes their translation to Saragossa in Spain by three monks in the middle of the seventh century, after the spread of Islam in Palestine. Father Gams may boast of being the first scholar who has dragged out of the dust of Spanish libraries the bull "*Vox in excelso audita est lamentationis*," by which Clement V. suppressed the order of the Templars: he published it in Germany in 1865. A large part of the fifth volume is occupied with the nature, the object, and the introduction of the Inquisition. It was not originated by the Church; it was, on the contrary, a mere State institution. Every period in the Church's history has its peculiar drawbacks; one of the grievous evils endangering the Spanish Church consisted in that immense—not to say overwhelming—power of the sovereigns which was not far from totally stifling her life. "In Spain the clergy looked up to the King as the one man bestowing graces, dignities, and salaries. A case is not known (?) in which the Pope refused to appoint a royal nominee. The Royal Council of Castile exerted an almost unlimited jurisdiction also over the clergy; as a matter of fact, it was the last and highest tribunal. Except the Church of Toledo and the Jesuits, the whole clergy applied to the '*recursos de fuerza appellatio ab abusu*' (vol. v. 513)." In our days the condition of the Spanish clergy is very different; they have, indeed, been deprived of worldly splendour and material riches, but as to love and faithfulness towards the Holy See, they are second to the clergy of no other country. Dr. Gams's work is based on extensive studies and original documents, and is deserving of a wide circulation.

Two able articles in the January and February issues describe the meritorious part taken by the Church during the Middle Ages in the construction of bridges. The author brings many proofs taken from

the several European countries. A special interest attaches to the notices he brings of England from the registers of the archbishops of York and the bishops of Durham. In those times, the construction of bridges was regarded as a very meritorious work, and the Catholic bishops were foremost in helping it, by granting indulgences. Elvet bridge in Durham, Otley bridge in York, and many others were completed in this way. The author of "Wanderings of Jansenism through Europe," describes in his contribution to the February issue another champion of Jansenism in Austria. This was the unfortunate ex-Capuchin, Fessler, who in 1782 published the pamphlet, "What is the Emperor?" Joseph II., having perused it, is reported to have said: "This man we must esteem and employ." Fessler strongly vindicated in words the Jansenistic "rigueur des principes morales," but in his life, so far from following it, became totally profligate, and sank into the deepest misery.

The September issue contains an article on "Secret Italian Politics, 1863-1870." Two interesting books treating on that Machiavellian policy to which the Holy See has been cruelly sacrificed, have just appeared in Turin and Rome. The following bears the title "*Politica Segreta Italiana, 1863-1870.*" The learned Professor Balan, second keeper of the Vatican archives, using the valuable documents published by the Pope's adversaries, brought out in Rome "*La politica Italiana dal 1863-1870, secondo gli ultimi documenti.*" A diligent perusal of these two books is enough to destroy any lingering esteem for the late King of Italy, who generally has been described as being dragged on by his Ministers or the Revolution. On the contrary, it was the King who decidedly worked for the destruction of the temporal power. There are also given clear hints as to what part Germany took in the breaking down of the Porta Pia, September 20, 1870.

2. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach.*—Father Cathrein, in the February issue, treats on "Socialism and Liberalism struggling against each other for the right of property." Liberalism, in giving up the Christian principles concerning property and its use, necessarily must be swallowed up by Socialism. Christian jurisprudence and philosophy have always deduced the right of property from the will of God. But as Liberalism aims at separating society and property from God, basing them only on the will of man, it could not object to a law abolishing private property, and declaring it to be property of the society. In the same issue F. Spillmann tells the history of the martyrdom of F. Lewis, in South Wales, under William III.; and F. Beissel describes Cologne Cathedral.

3. *Literarische Rundschau.*—In the January issue we meet with a criticism of considerable weight, contributed by Professor Hettinger, on the "Système des médiocrités," advocated some years ago by a certain French theologian for the seminaries of that country. When Count de Maistre published his work "Du Pape," he excused himself for treating

of questions that were the special property of divines by the sad fact that the veterans of the French clergy, owing to the disastrous effects of the Revolution, had passed away, whilst he hoped that a time would come when the French clergy would again be admirable, both by their sanctity and vast learning. In our days we are condemned to hear praised a system of spiritual starvation to which the French seminaries are to be sacrificed; the "Système des médiocrités." Against this system two learned books have appeared: "Quelques observations soumises à NN.SS. les Evêques concernant les études des Séminaires en France. Par un Prélat romain, résidant à Paris," and "Lettre en réponse aux objections touchant la réforme des études des Séminaires." The author, a high ecclesiastical dignitary, cites the "Système" before the tribunal of the Fathers and the Scholastics, pointing out the words of S. Thomas, that the *Summa Theologica* was written "ad eruditionem incipientium," and having utterly condemned it, he goes on to ask that two years may be devoted to the study of philosophy, and four years to that of theology. He exclaims: "You would educate practical theologians, and are you not aware that every act of the clergy ought to be illumined and supported by those sublime principles which are to be derived only from the centres of philosophy and theology." In a period which witnesses the old religious Orders who have ever ranked foremost in France and the cultivation of theology—the Jesuits and Dominicans—crushed by the blows of a liberal, or rather an unmerciful party, the lessons given by this "Roman dignitary" ought to be duly attended to.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Scuola Cattolica. 30 Novembre, 1880.

1. *The Rosminian Philosophy.*

THE *Scuola Cattolica* has been much occupied in its late numbers with the subject of the Rosminian Philosophy. While expressing respect, as all must, for Rosmini personally, it regards his metaphysical doctrines as involving dangerous consequences, which the magnificent restoration of the teaching of St. Thomas in the schools by Leo XIII. will, it expects, effectually counteract. The attempt of Rosmini's followers to prove that the *Dimittatur* of the Congregation of the Index, pronounced with reference to his works in July, 1854, amounted to a formal approbation, being, they would have it, equivalent to "nihil censura dignum," whereas it is simply a negative declaration, that of non-prohibition, is dealt with both in this periodical and in the *Civiltà Cattolica*. "The *Dimittatur*," says the *Civiltà Cattolica* of February 5, 1881 (in its review of a recent work of Cardinal Zigliara on this subject, upon which, as being a member of the Congregation of the Index, he is a high authority), signifies exclusively the negative of the *prohibetur*. Hence, it argues, whatever the attending circumstances may have been, such as a prolonged examination, the presence of the Pope in the Congregation, &c., the nature of this judgment can never be altered. A book thus dismissed

can be freely discussed and combated in the philosophical and theological arenas, it may be examined anew by Roman Congregations, and it may finally be even prohibited.

Further, the writers in the *Scuola* are of opinion that Rosmini's philosophical system is actually proscribed as unsound and pernicious in the Encyclical "*Æterni Patris*," and, as they contend, it has thus been generally understood by the faithful. But what they consider as most worthy of remark is the interpretation put upon the Encyclical by the great body of the Episcopate, as they undertake to prove in the course of an article entitled "*La Odierna Questione Filosofica giudicata senz' entrare in Filosofia*," which appeared in their number of November, 1880. This interpretation is expressed more or less explicitly and distinctly in the numerous letters of adhesion addressed by bishops to the Sovereign Pontiff, an interpretation quite opposite to what the partizans of Rosmini strive to put upon it. It is also remarkable that, although there are not wanting some bishops who still cling to Rosminianism, nevertheless one only, as would appear, the Bishop of Casale, has written to the Pontiff, giving to the Encyclical an interpretation favourable to it. The letter in which the Holy Father made reply, while courteously expressed, showed evident disapprobation. This disapprobation forms a striking contrast with the favourable reception he has given to the letters of those bishops who have interpreted the "*Æterni Patris*" as condemnatory of the new philosophy. As an instance, the *Scuola Cattolica* alleges an address signed on the 28th of August by seventy priests, the document being endorsed and published by the Bishop of Vigevano, in which they engaged to follow in its entirety the teaching of the Angelic Doctor, *etiam contra recentiora systemata, inter quæ et Rosminianum recensendum, uti tu pandere tot modis dignatus es*. In the circular in which this address was issued, Mgr. Di Gaudenzi, the Bishop of Vigevano, distinctly enunciated the same sentiments, naming especially the Rosminian philosophy.

It will, doubtless, be remembered that two works of the Abate Rosmini, "*Le cinque piaghe della Chiesa*" and "*La costituzione secondo la giustizia sociale*," were actually placed on the Index in the year 1849. This condemnation drew more particular attention to his works of speculative philosophy, and the discussion waxed hot. In 1851 all the works of Rosmini were by some one referred for examination to the Sacred Congregation of the Index. By that time his system had acquired much celebrity, and had taken the place in almost all the schools of Italy of other preceding systems, with the exception of that of St. Thomas. The Pope, out of regard for the person of the illustrious writer, had these works subjected to a careful examination, which extended over three years, but, as the writer observes, the length of time and the care expended are not altogether favourable indications, but rather tend to prove that the case of Rosmini was hard and difficult. The *Dimittatur* was finally given, but it must be remembered that that sentence does not possess the force of a public ecclesiastical law; it is never published, but only communicated to the parties who

have moved the judgment *in foro externo*. In this case most persons knew nothing about the sentence, and it is only recently that attention has been called to it. According to the text, as stated, the person of the meritorious writer, as well as the religious society founded by him, are expressly excluded from the question at issue.

The great affinity which exists between Ontologism and Rosminianism, observes the writer of "*La Questione Filosofica sotto il Pontificato di Pio IX.*," was calculated to suggest the suspicion that some at least of the censures pronounced by the Sacred Congregation against the former system might strike also at that of Rosmini; the more so, as a posthumous work of his, published in 1859, and therefore subsequent to the *Dimittatur*, entitled "*Il nuovo Saggio sull'origine dell' idee*," was marked by a much clearer approach to Ontologistic views than had appeared in his former publication on this subject. The points of divergence between Rosmini and the Ontologists with reference to intuition have been carefully elaborated in the pages of the *Scuola Cattolica*, which arrived at the conclusion that there is a distinction without a substantial difference. Be this as it may, Rosminianism could not but be regarded as a kind of branch of Ontologism, with which it has many points of contact, and, as such, would feel the *contre-coup* of its condemnation; and, in point of fact, the censures pronounced against it were not seldom applied by grave and thoughtful persons to the Rosminian system, or, at least, to those bad interpretations to which it too frequently lent itself. Nevertheless, the knowledge that Rosminianism was never on the *tapis* during the examination of the Ontologistic propositions, which its professors were finally called upon to retract in 1866,* tended to set misgivings at rest, and no one took occasion of the censures on Ontologism to raise at that period an alarm against Rosminianism.

The system of the philosopher of Rovereto has certainly never been formally condemned up to this time, but the *Scuola* considers it to be practically censured by the "*Æterni Patris*;" for the Pope, in expressing his desire that in the schools the philosophy of St. Thomas should be taught, has necessarily assumed its truth, and, in excluding systems which do not agree with it, he must, on the other hand, necessarily assume them to be erroneous. But why, then, say the objectors, has he not named Rosmini expressly? We have no right, says the *Scuola*, to scrutinize what may be the motives of the Holy Father, but, if it may be allowed to hazard a conjecture, we might say that the Pope has not named Rosmini in particular because the naming of him would have limited and minimised his object; for the Encyclical was directed, not against the philosophy of Rosmini alone, but against all those systems which are not in accordance with that of St. Thomas. To have specified him, would have marred this universality of application. The Holy Father, no doubt, may think that for those who are willing to understand, he has spoken plainly enough; for those who are not, clearer language would not suffice, and would

* The person of Professor Ubaghs was always respected, and even his books were never put on the Index.

have no effect but that of adding to their culpability. It must be remembered, however, that, when speaking of censure and condemnation, the Review expressly states that it does not mean to assert that the Encyclical condemns the works of Rosmini, but only excludes the Rosminian system from the schools. In this exclusion all other philosophical systems discordant with the Scholastic, and which had more or less substituted themselves for it, are equally comprehended.

In conclusion we will quote the words of another writer in the same number of the *Scuola*, who is replying to the arguments of the *Sapienza* of Turin, a Rosminian journal. "The defence of the person of Rosmini is a thing which any one who has a mind to fight with phantoms may undertake, because no one has come forth to attack him. The whole question in debate at present is as to the merit of his philosophy, and when we maintain that it is perilous and ought to be repudiated, it is very far from our desire to raise any doubt as to his piety, his mental powers, or his good and holy intentions."

This whole subject is ably pursued in subsequent numbers.*

2. *The Roman Malaria.* 31 Dicembre, 1880; 31 Gennajo, 1881.

THERE have been two articles in the *Scuola Cattolica* on the Malaria of the Agro Romano since our former notice. In the first of these the causes continue to be treated in detail; in the last, which appeared in the January number, proof is given that the evil has been in gradual and increasing operation very much longer than is generally supposed. When it is stated that the whole of the Agro was flourishing and extremely populous during the times of the Roman Empire, the assertion must be accepted with some reserve. The originally habitable portion has been narrowing for ages, and we have recorded testimony in ancient writers to the comparative insalubrity of the region, even while it was still habitable and inhabited. The causes at work, which were progressively increasing this insalubrity, continued, however, to be largely under control so long as the present delta had not been deposited, with the exception of one of them, namely, that caused by the inequality of the surface of the ground, having frequent depressions in the form of hollows in which little stagnant pools established themselves, of which the character of the soil, a spongy tufa resting on an impermeable bed of marl, prevented the absorption. The Agro Romano was, therefore, in those days, though still habitable, not healthy, and pasture predominated over agriculture. The testimony of Cato, in the sixth century of Rome, is adduced, and the still more telling evidence to be drawn from Plutarch's Life of Camillus, who, referring to it as to a well-recognized fact, attributes the mortality amongst the Gauls, when beleaguering

* In recording the comments and observations of the excellent periodicals here referred to, we must not be understood as agreeing with all their inferences. The philosophy of a genius like Rosmini deserves the gravest consideration. We may say at once that we have good reason to believe that that philosophy was not in the mind of the Holy Father when he condemned anti-Thomistic systems in the "*Æterni Patris*." We hope soon to treat the subject in an article.

the Capitol, to the malaria of the vicinity ; thus proving that it was in powerful operation nearly twenty-three centuries ago. Livy also speaks of this mortality, of the marshy hollows, and of the vicissitudes of climate in that region. The writer continues to trace historically its further deterioration, and satisfactorily exonerates the Middle Ages and the Papal Government from the charge brought against them, a charge which even those who lay this accusation at their door implicitly contradict by their own statements in reference to the physical causes which have been at work.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Janvier, 1881. Paris.

"**L**E Passage de la Mer Rouge par les Hebreux" is another of the series, "The Bible and Egyptology," from the industrious pen of the Sulpitian M. Vigouroux. The article may be recommended to the attention of scholars as a lucid and well-argued presentment of an original view on the long-debated question of locality. It has another recommendation ; it supplies a complete summary of the history of the question, and contains in the notes a quite sufficient, if not complete, bibliography of works in German, French and English. This character of thoroughness and simplicity is very praiseworthy ; so many men of less erudition than the learned Sulpitian aim in similar articles apparently at parade of reading and brilliancy of theory, rather than at a winning patience of explanation, or a cautious testing of their supposed facts. These words of praise are equally deserved by the writer even if one should refuse to be won over to an absolute acceptance of the particular theory he defends. The difficulties to be overcome in attempting to trace on the Egypt of to-day the path of the Hebrew people towards the Land of Promise, will suggest themselves immediately in discouraging magnitude. Man's "foot-prints on the sands of time" are proverbially quick to be effaced, but long ago the *trace* of Israel's footstep has passed into uncertain tradition, and perhaps the sands themselves of the Egyptian desert have buried the very city from which he started. The locality, as M. Vigouroux says, has been "*bouleversée par la nature et par les hommes.*" Where was that Ramesses from which the children of Israel set forward, "being about six hundred thousand men on foot, besides children?" And at what point on the Egyptian border of the Red Sea did Moses smite the waters, and lay open the dry way for their passage? These—"le point de départ et le point d'arrivée"—are the objects of the learned writer's earnest search ; and in spite of lapsed ages, new peoples, sand-drifts, and changes of even the physiognomy of the land, he does not despair of rising above the disapproval of existing systems to the establishment of a more probable one. His destructive attack is chiefly dealt against the routes adopted respectively by Père Sicard, M. Lacointre, and by the (in this country) better known Dr. Brugsch. Only the author's conclusions can be here stated ; recourse must be had to the article for

proof and authority. Having accounted for the prevalence of a wrong opinion concerning the topography of the Hebrew Exodus, from the time of Josephus to the approach of this "critical era"—the opinion that the march commenced from the vicinity of Memphis or Cairo—the author states the theory of Père Sicard, who laboured in Egypt during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, and whom he justly styles "the worthy precursor of our Egyptologists in the land of the Pharaohs." Ramesses was, according to this author, identical with the little village of Bessatin, three leagues from Old Cairo to the east of the Nile; the route pursued hence to the Red Sea was eastward through the valley between Mounts Tora and Diouchi. This itinerary, M. Vigouroux contends, starts from a mistaken "point de départ;" had this been correct, Moses would doubtless have followed the route traced from it. Memphis was not, as Père Sicard thought, the residence of the then Pharaoh, and Ramesses is not Bessatin; when the plagues afflicted Egypt the royal residence was at Tanis (Ps. lxxii. 12 and 43). This Tanis, it is now well established, was not directly westward of the north point of the Red Sea (as is Memphis), but to the north-west, and in the immediate vicinity of the land of Gessen. In 1874, first at a Conference at Alexandria, and then at the Congress of Orientalists in London, Brugsch-Bey propounded another and new route, farther from the truth than the route just discussed. His point of departure was also wrong; his Ramesses being Zoan or Tanis; but his passage by the Mediterranean, not the Red Sea, is "a grave and reprehensible error." His identification of Tanis rests on the discovery of the name Pi-ramesses on monuments discovered there, and is worthless as proof that it is the biblical Ramesses; for there are several places of that name. The Pentateuch proves that the town whence the Israelites started was not the capital and residence of the Pharaoh: also that Tanis (Zoan) is not in the land of Gessen.

In all probability, says M. Vigouroux, "Ramesses was built on the banks of the fresh-water canal which traverses the Wadi-t-Tumeylat, to the east, near to Tel-el-Maschuta, or Abu-Keschab, between Tel-el-Kebir and lake Timsah." There are to be found the vestiges of an ancient canal, and an immense block of granite representing in relief Ramesses II., the Pharaoh who had forced the Israelites to work for the adornment of the city to which he gave his name. The ruins around this monument are of brick—bricks of Nile clay mixed with straw—and are the *debris* of the city walls. Having disposed of some other portions of Dr. Brugsch's route, the author discusses the direction taken by the Israelites after leaving the Ramesses just identified. Most scholars at the present day, he remarks, admit that this point of departure was on the borders of the above-mentioned canal, and that at a certain point in the eastward journey Moses turned abruptly southward; but they are quite of various opinions as to the locality of his crossing the Red Sea. Most of the engineers engaged in piercing the Isthmus of Suez have supposed that at the date of the Exodus the Red Sea was united to the Bitter Lakes; many of them again have contended that the Israelites crossed the

Bitter Lakes (M. de Lesseps, for example, places the crossing near Serapeum). Their proof of the former continuity of the lakes and the sea is founded on the salt deposits of the former and the peculiar *coquillages* found in the lakes, which are identical with those found in the Gulf of Suez. It is at this point that the author dissents from the opinion of M. Lecoindre, who also takes the Hebrews across the Bitter Lakes, but at a point further south than Serapeum. This dissent is made with much courtesy, and a glad recognition of M. Lecoindre's learning and the true Christian spirit of his researches. "One argument," says M. Vigouroux, "appears to us decisive against M. Lecoindre; the ridge (*seuil*) of Chalouf, which intercepts communication [at the present day] between the sea and the lakes is, to speak the language of geologists, of Tertiary formation; in other words, it is anterior to Moses by many ages." This crucial point is established by the testimony of M. de Mauriac, a French engineer, and M. Fraas, a German geologist. In the days of Moses, therefore, the Bitter Lakes were not continuous, any more than now, with the Red Sea; therefore the children of Israel journeyed further south than it is customary to mark their route. M. Vigouroux brings them to the vicinity of Suez, though not quite so far to the south as the Père Sicard's point of crossing. Socoth, of Exodus xii. 37, having been most probably only a nomad encampment (Socoth = tents), he thinks will never be identified. Etham was perhaps a part of a line of fortifications raised by the Pharaohs against the nomad Arabs. We can only indicate those of his conclusions which satisfy the requirements of Exod. xiv. 2. Beelsephon is most probably the chain of mountains now known as Jeb-el-Atakah, to the south-west of Suez, and critics have, with much plausibility, identified the present Ajrud as the Pi-hahiroth of Exodus. Ajrud is situate between the Bitter Lakes and the Gulf, about four hours' march to the north-west of Suez, in a vast plain where encampment would be easy. When the Hebrews had reached this plain the approach of Pharaoh and his hosts enclosed the fugitives in a kind of prison—on the east the Gulf, on the west the chain of Jeb-el-Atakah advancing so near to the sea that only in narrow ranks could the multitudes slowly pass through the defile. The chariots of Pharaoh placed across the route by which Moses might have sought the desert, occupying the north and north-east, left the Israelites no earthly resource. At this point, then, Moses struck the waters in the Red Sea of to-day.

In a final section the author defends the miraculous nature of the passage of the Red Sea against the various attempted naturalistic explanations. It may not be useless to remark that the Abbé Ancessi's "Atlas Géographique et Archéologique" of the Old and New Testaments, has a chart of the Isthmus of Suez in the time of Moses, on which the diverse routes of Sicard, Lecoindre, and Brugsch are printed in different colours. The distinct indication of these three systems is a great help to following the arguments in this very interesting article. M. Vigouroux is zealous for an honest interpretation of the Mosaic narrative; and it must be confessed that the various stages of

that narrative (in Exodus xiii. and xiv.), especially the "turn" (xiv. 2) from Etham, "in the utmost coasts of the wilderness," to Pi-hahiroth, are apparently best realized in his route: whilst he contends that Dr. Brugsch's "crossing" over Lake Menzaleh, and M. Lecomte's over the Bitter Lakes, do not satisfy the requirements of the Sacred Text.

"*Les Articles Secrets; Pacification de la Vendée en 1795,*" by M. de la Sicoitière, deserves that at least attention should be drawn to it. The writer purposes to discuss and follow the question to its sources, with equal freedom from Royalist or Revolutionary prejudices. The article contains a mass of references and documents that will be new to many English readers; and it is intensely interesting, as must be any able study of that desperate Vendean war. The point in discussion is this: "Is it certain that when the Treaty of Pacification of the 29 Pluviose of the year III (17th February, 1795) was concluded between the Representatives of the people on one side, and Charette and Cormatin on the other, it was secretly agreed, outside the official articles intended for publication, that royalty should be re-established, and that the children of Louis XVI. should be placed in the hands of Charette in the month of June following, or simply that this disposition of them should be effected?" The supposition is improbable; appears indeed quite impossible. The writer describes the state of affairs in 1795—the anxiety on both sides that bloodshed might cease. He then gives *in extenso* the 22 Articles of Vendean demands drawn up by Charette and sent to the Representatives on the 12th February; the Declaration actually signed on the 17th by the Royalists; and the *arrêts* of the Representatives, five in number, and signed with eleven signatures. That there were other secret agreements appears certain—did some of them refer to the restoration of royalty? The writer shows how earnestly the Convention desired peace; he then quotes the documents in which the Royalists mention these secret articles—"solemnly promised"—for the restoration of Catholicity and royalty, conceded to gain the much-desired pacification of Vendée. The critical examination of the authenticity and force of these documents, and the expressions in them are very able. The writer concludes:—1st. There were never any "Secret Articles" *in writing*; on this point the testimony of Charette and others must outweigh that of Napoleon. 2nd. It is not yet proved that there were Articles, properly so called, discussed and resolved upon, even verbally, in conference between Republican and Royalist, stipulating for the restoration of monarchy or the return of the royal children to Charette. 3rd. But it seems very certain that there were overtures on these points made by the Royalist chiefs to some of the Representatives; and that these overtures, far from being repulsed, received countenance and promises more or less evasive. 4th. How far the Committee of Public Safety was involved cannot be precisely determined: probably not collectively. 5th. Did the Republican Representatives intend to keep their promises? "The thing would have been difficult if they had wished. Very few of them were in good faith; but all, or nearly

all—if the Bourbon cause had triumphed—would have claimed the price of their promises, and attributed to themselves the honour of the success." 6th. Were the Royalists in good faith on their side when they signed the treaty? Probably both sides regarded the treaty as rather a truce; the official Articles were not scrupulously observed on either side; but who can say if the *inexécution* of the Secret Articles or promises was not either chief motive or pretext with the Royalists for resuming arms? However it may be, the state of public opinion in 1795, looking to and even negotiating for the near re-establishment of monarchy, and the vitality of the "inexplicable Vendée," are subjects well worthy the attention of the student of history.

2. *Revue Générale*. Février, 1881. Bruxelles.

"**L**E Suicide en Europe," by M. A. Reynaert, Member of the Chamber of Representatives, contains some curious details on a melancholy topic. The Article is chiefly occupied with the statistics and conclusions of Prof. E. Morselli (Direttore del Manicomio di Macerata) in his late work, "*Il Suicidio, Saggio di statistica morale comparata*." M. Morselli's comparative table embraces suicide statistics in all civilized countries; he is a man of penetration and learning, and some of his conclusions are the more valuable as he has no leaning towards Catholicity—is, on the contrary, a disciple of Darwinism, and believes with Haeckel that "the degree of mental development of a people is measured by the facility with which it accepts 'evolutionism.'" For him suicide is a simple social phenomenon, ruled, as are other like phenomena, by inflexible if yet imperfectly discovered laws.

The first most indubitable result of statistics is evidence that suicides are steadily increasing; and this is confirmed by other statisticians. The force of this conclusion not a few authors earnestly endeavour to weaken by various explanations, chiefly by this, that only of late years have records and statistics been carefully or at all kept. To this it is answered that the regular and rapid increase has been as noteworthy within the recent years of register-books and statistics. Prof. Morselli admits this, attributing the increase to civilization; remarking that savage peoples *ne se suicident pas* except through hunger or fanaticism. M. Wagner has shown that the regular growth of the number of suicides, during a long series of years, exceeds that of the numbers of births, deaths, or marriages. The Article quotes the percentage of suicides in a million inhabitants of Sweden, Russia, England, Prussia, and other countries. But the suicidal movement is by no means identical in different countries; so varied, indeed, that authors search for the reasons of the diversity. Whilst upholding sound doctrine on free-will, one may admit tendencies affecting certain peoples towards suicide as well as outward circumstances. Morselli enumerates first, race, religion, and social culture; and chief among external causes, climate, seasons, and atmospheric vicissitudes. Thus the north of Europe has been always recognised as "the classic land of suicide:" Tacitus and Suetonius expressing, at that remote time,

their wonder at contempt of life in German, Celt, and Briton: Montesquieu in his day giving to foggy England *la triste suprématie* in matter of suicides. But statistics do not allow this decisive influence of climate. The author sees one fact clearly through them; that the ratio of suicides increases both from north and south towards the centre—especially latitude 50 of Europe. He cites the noteworthy difference (19 per million of inhabitants) between the northern provinces of Belgium—Antwerp, Brabant, East and West Flanders, &c., and the southern provinces, Hainault, Liège, &c. The seasons exercise great influence. In a hundred cases the maximum of suicides occurred thirty times in summer, three times in spring, once in autumn; the minimum occurred thirty times in winter and four times in autumn. Suicides increase in the first period of each month, and are rarer in each week on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, especially in cities.

As to the question of race, Teutons and Scandinavians excel; Saxony, where the Teuton race is best preserved, having the highest average in Germany: Italy and Spain, the purest in Latin element, standing lowest. What is the influence of religion? The figures of these authors show that where Catholicism exercises most vigour, suicides are more rare; the writer ventures on the assertion that in Catholic countries (he reckons Italy, Spain, Portugal, Ireland), the average is about 58 per million; in "mixed" countries, 96; in Protestant countries, 190 per million. Prof. Morselli admits that scepticism begets suicides. As to education, he asserts that the more of this there is among a people, the fewer the suicides; but the more numerous, in inverse ratio, are "crimes against the person," and *vice versa*. As to sex, the proportion in all countries is one woman to two or three men; whilst criminality is in the ratio of one woman to four or five men. For 100 suicides of married persons are counted:—

	Celibates.	Widowed.	Divorced.
In Italy	108	157	—
„ France	112	196	—
„ Wurtemberg . .	143	156	139

We must perforce leave aside the very instructive details as to the number of suicides in the various systems of prison discipline in European countries, and the most curious section on the marked preference in different countries of different instruments and modes of self-destruction. Taking the world at large, "the rope" holds the first place as a means; next come in order—water, fire, pointed and then cutting arms, jumping from a height, and finally charcoal and poison. Taking countries, Italy most frequently drowns itself, France hangs, Prussia strangulates, England poisons, but here side-arms are disputing the palm. Prof. Morselli is sure that suicide is an effect of the struggle for existence and of "selection;" it will continue during the period of the civilization of humanity. His only prophylactic, meanwhile, is "to develop in man the power of co-ordinating his sentiments and ideas so as to attain a certain end in life; briefly, to give to moral character force and energy." One may well ask him,

what more *apropos* here than the Christian faith? Where such a school of force and energy as modifying the moral character as the Catholic church?

Since this notice was written, we have seen in the *Contemporary Review* for January of this year, a well-written article on "Suicidal Mania" by W. Knighton, LL.D. It does not go into such detail as does the above article by Mr. Reynaert, but it brings into prominence the same important fact as is there mentioned, that suicides are becoming annually more frequent all over the civilized world. Some interesting cases are quoted; and amongst facts not mentioned in the *Belgian Review* there is one worth mentioning—that "suicide appears very common" in Japan; a statement taken from Miss Bird's "Unbeaten Tracks in Japan." We also happen to notice that a volume on Suicide by Professor Morselli himself is announced to appear shortly in English.

Notices of Books.

The Sacred Book of the East, translated by various Oriental Scholars:
Vol. IV. Zend-Avesta. By M. DARMESTETER. P. I. Vendidad.
Edited by Prof. MAX MÜLLER. London: Clarendon Press.

EVERY attempt to solve the remaining difficulties that bar the way to a perfectly accurate and indisputable interpretation of the Avesta is no doubt worth the attention of the learned world: the one we are about to examine is certainly not less so than any other. The work was announced some time ago, and great hopes of progress were founded upon it. Various opinions as to its merits have already been pronounced, and whilst one *savant* severely criticizes all that part of the work which is M. Darmesteter's own, another, not a specialist, bestows unqualified praise on the whole of this new version, proclaiming it superior to any other. We heartily wish we could endorse this latter view of it; but we owe, in the first place, a duty to our readers. We proceed, therefore, to put before them the result of a careful examination of the work. As a rule, the version of M. Darmesteter resembles our own. The author has even adopted interpretations which he formerly disputed; as, for instance, those of *mairiyô*, *geredhô*, *frashmo dâiti*, &c. We by no means find fault with him on this account, and we notice the fact merely because M. Darmesteter has chosen to conceal it from his readers, and that, as a critic remarks, it might have been better not to do this.

In some rare instances he prefers to follow the version of Spiegel, and it is not for us to blame him for doing so. The opinions of Dr. Spiegel are always worthy of respect even, when one may not agree with them; but there are many interpretations of words and phrases which are the young Zendist's own—these we will examine carefully. And first of all we note that the meaning (*saffron*) given to

çaokenta, in the derivative *çaokentavaiti* (saffron-water, used in the trial by ordeal) seems to us perfectly admissible. We can also regard without regret the banishment from the Avestian Pandemonium of the dog *Madhaka*, whose existence has always appeared to us doubtful. But, on the other hand, it requires more weighty reasons to reconcile us to its transformation into "gnats and grasshoppers," and especially to the inscribing in the Avestian lexicon the meaning "gnat" to the word *çpan* or *çün*. After this fashion we may easily enrich any glossary with imaginary words. There may also be some truth in the distinction adopted by Justi between the words *cithravaiti* and *dakhsh-tavaiti* (feminine rules normal or not); but its application to § 84 of chapter xvi. is scarcely possible, for reasons which we cannot here enter into. So far, this is all of which we can approve in the explanations peculiar to M. Darmesteter. All the rest is but little calculated to advance science, even when not positively erroneous.

Sometimes M. Darmesteter trusts to the most recent and least certain traditions rather than to those more ancient and therefore more trustworthy. Sometimes he pins his faith to a lexicon dating from the latter period of the Middle Ages, and full of errors (*Farhangi oim haduk*), rather than to the Pahlavi version, earlier by many centuries. Sometimes he chooses the Pahlavi glosses of the second class—very often too fanciful ones—in preference to the first, which are more ancient and weighty. For instance, the Pahlavi lexicon gives to the word *uruthware* the meaning of "stomach," and the Pahlavi glosses that of "increase, development, progress;" but M. Darmesteter stops short at the former meaning, and makes Zoroaster ask the singular question: "What is the stomach of the Mazdayasnian law?" Then the Iranian reformer demands, "What is the means of the growth, the progress, the prosperity of the law?"

We may, however, remark that the word *uruthware* has probably two meanings and forms, two distinct terms, the one (growth) being derived from *urud* (to grow), and the other coming from *urud* (to flow).

In the beginning of Fargard IV., the Avesta condemns him who does not grant the *nemô* when it is due. This word has been very variously translated. It has been rendered as request, salute, honour, and loan. The first gloss explains it as meaning "request"—benefit, charity requested; the second, as a loan. Now the etymology of this word (*Rac. nam*, to comply with, to bow down, to honour, to supplicate) allows the three first meanings, but excludes the last. The translation of M. Darmesteter is consequently defective.

In most other cases the new explanations require proof even when they do not run contrary to the text, or even create inexplicable errors. We will quote, for example, chapter i. 54, where the distinctive sign of the *Yâtus* (magic spirits) is spoken of. M. Darmesteter takes the word *paitidayo* as designating this sign, and translates it "evil eye." Now this word, in *Yesht VIII. 44*, is applied to the star *Tistrya*, and cannot consequently mean anything evil. Besides, to construe the phrase as this translation requires, the masculine of the adjective

cithrô (evident) must be confounded with the neuter substantive *cithrem* (sign), and the evident parallelism of the members of the sentence destroyed.

In the same chapter, § 78, M. Darmesteter describes the inhabitants of the banks of the Ranha as monstrous beings, who *exist without heads* (who have heads on the chest or between the shoulders); in this manner he translates *açaro aiwiâkshayentê*.

Now, quite contrary to this supposition—in itself but little probable—*aiwiâkshayê* does not mean to exist, but to be established upon, to be settled, to regulate themselves. This term applies to the social condition of its subject. On the other hand, *açaro* signifies undoubtedly “without ruler, without king,” for it is said of the *dévas*. Lastly, in the Avesta the inhabitants of the Ranha are spoken of several times, and they are never described as having a nature in any way monstrous (see II. 16 Gloss.). § 230 *seq.* of chapter viii. treat of the duties of the Mazdayasnians, who suddenly come upon a fire in which a dead body is burning. The Avesta, in a perfectly clear text, prescribes in such case that the fire be extinguished by stamping on the blazing wood. “If the Mazdayasnians find a fire *burning a dead body* (*naçupaka* = νεκροπῆρος), let them stamp on this that is burning a dead body (*aêtem naçupakem* = αὐτον νεκροπῆρον). For this meaning, so perfectly simple, M. Darmesteter substitutes: “Let them kill him who kindled the fire,” thus attributing to the authors of the Avesta a barbarous prescription, the existence of which there is no reason to suppose.

Further on, in chapter vii. 78, the Avesta propounds the principle that the corpse of a man or a dog is more deeply impregnated with impurity when it has not been torn (*aiwighnikhtô*) by wild animals. M. Darmesteter asserts that here the funeral ceremony called *sagdîd* is referred to, in which a dog was placed before a dying person, that the look of this animal might drive away evil spirits. Consequently he renders the word *zend* by “looked.” Now the text says distinctly, “If this dead body has been *aiwighnikhtô* by voracious dogs and carnivorous birds.” Something quite different therefore is evidently referred to, and the Avesta alludes to the Mazdayasnian superstitions, which held as of good augury the eager haste of wild beasts and vultures to prey upon the dead bodies exposed upon the mountains. To this day the Parsis erect small buildings in their burying-grounds, from whence they watch with anxiety for the approach of birds of prey, and when the corpse has been torn by these birds of good omen, they deem that it has lost its impurity.

According to M. Darmesteter, the term *peshotanus* (a varied form of *peretotanus*), which denotes “sinner” and plays a great part in the Avesta, means “he who owes his body as a debt,” and signifies technically one who has to be chastised with two hundred strokes of the whip. This etymology and this resolving of the meaning are equally false. *Pereto*, the past participle of *per*, *par* (to pass, to traverse, to perish), signifies “perished, lost;” *âpereta* means passed, effaced, expired; *andâperetha*, is “inexpiated, inexpiable;” *pârem* is “expiation,” and probably by derivation, the thing to be expiated, the debt; but *pereto* can never mean “owed as a debt.”

The meaning given to the compound *peretotanus* (from *tanu*, body) is not more correct. If the § 69, and likewise that of Fargard IV., were the only sources relating to this term, we might consider the explanation given as probable. Yet for this the terms of the § 69 must be inaccurately translated, and this is what M. Darmesteter has done, as we shall see later on; but the § 57 and the known sequel of chapter xv. sufficiently prove the erroneousness of this theory.

The author of chapter v. 165, employs, in order to describe a certain kind of blow, the terms *aipijato pistro*. The word *aipijato* is known, "struck on;" *pistro* alone presents a difficulty. M. Darmesteter gives it the meaning of occupation; and translates the compound altogether as "struck by a blow which makes it impossible for one to continue his occupation." It is, he says, a technical term.

It is not difficult to prove that this is impossible. In the first place, tradition knows nothing of terms of this kind; and also a meaning contrived by such an extravagance of addition is certainly not admissible; *aipijatopistro* would signify by this hypothesis "whose occupation struck," nothing more. But this is not all; in chapter xiii. 26, it is said, speaking of a dog, *yô pistrem jainti*—he who strikes it with a *pistrem*—which cannot be explained if we admit the meaning given by our author. Thus we are compelled again to transform these very simple expressions and to translate them thus: "he who strikes a dog in such a way as to make it unable to continue its employment" (that of a dog!), whilst the text would signify "he who strikes the occupation of a dog," expressions without any meaning. Finally, *pistrem* does not signify "occupation, service;" it denotes the classes of the nation, the social condition of the priest, the warrior, the agriculturist (see *Yaçna* XIX. 46), which leads us still further away from this supposed meaning. The most extraordinary thing in this is that the terms in question are some of the most clear and simple. "If any one," says the text, "strikes a dog a blow which splits its ear." There is evidently here no question of a wound which makes its usual employment impossible. Further, *pistrem* is here used precisely as *qarem*, wound, in chapter iv. 85-99.

Pistrem, in Fargard III., denotes wheat ground, made into paste; it means, therefore, something ground, bruised, a bruise, and its derivation is known; it comes from the *Ranah per*, to strike, to bruise. It is, therefore, a blow which bruises, or crushes, more or less severely.

Yô çânê qarem jainti is translated by all "he who (strikes) makes a wound." *Yô çânê pistrem jainti* can only be "he who makes a bruise."

These examples, to which we could add many more, prove sufficiently that the innovations of this new version are scarcely of a kind calculated to advance the cause of science. What still remains to be pointed out is not more so.

Several numbers of sentences are translated as if they had not been understood. Some of these we will cite, following the order of the chapters.

I. *Āat ahē paityārem frakerentāt anro mainyus pourumahrko*, which is repeated sixteen times, and signifies, at illius adversarium formavit A.M., is thus rendered: "But Anro Mainyus, who is quite dead, thereupon appears and counter creates by his magic."

IV. 70. *Aetahē paiti peshotanuyē*, for the peshotanus (the state of sin), is substituted, "He is peshotanus." *Id.* 133. *Hamaptibyo aiwibyō*, burning waters, is translated, "before the water and the burning fire."

V. 71. *Avi frā davaiti*, flown upwards, springs on high, is rendered "is more rapid than," although this construction destroys the parallelism of three comparisons, all of which refer to the height of objects.

Ganh and *hvar*, to eat (chapter vii. 141), *uzdath*, to raise (*id.* 181), *taokhman*, belonging to the family or tribe (xiii. 72), are respectively rendered "to feel, to rub, stranger."

Kva asti dāityōgātus, "where is the lawful or suitable place?" is translated, "what is he who ought to be called?" (xiii. seq.).

Yezi nōit nāirika niurudyāt, "unless the woman should be defiled," becomes "lest the woman should gather strength." Now, *yezi nōit* cannot mean "unless," and the prefix *ni* (below) cannot form a verb denoting increase (xvi. 17).

Nistā daeva, "perditi dæmones," is translated "he who destroys the devās," and the plural *nista* is made to agree with the singular *ashem*, purity (xviii. 37).

Yat na jahika (paçca 15 çaredhem) *frapataiti anaiviyāsta*, &c., is thus translated: "If a man or a woman go without a girdle," &c. But the word *or* is not in the text; *jahika* is a courtesan, not any woman; *anaiviyāsta* cannot relate to *na*—it is either feminine or plural. The real meaning is, "Si vir cum meretrice procedit discincta," &c. (xviii. 114).

Let us observe also this passage. At the end of chapter xiii., it is said the soul of a dead dog goes to the depths of the water, to the original source of the waves, where there preside two beavers, a male and a female, and there it finds itself in the company of a thousand dogs, male and female. M. Darmesteter interprets this quite differently. According to him, each couple of beavers proceeds from two thousand souls of dead dogs, male and female, reunited to their original source. Two thousand souls of dead dogs produce two couples of beavers! This does not appear to us particularly worthy of acceptance.

M. Darmesteter has simplified certain difficulties by suppressing some passages which seemed to him to be glosses. We should have expected at least to find them translated in a foot-note.

Before completing this cursory examination, we will say a word about the introduction.

This somewhat elaborate production (102 pages) describes, first of all, the well-known history of the discovery of the Avesta, and the method adopted by the author in his interpretation of the text; the history of the compilation of the Zend Avesta; the origin of the Avestian religion; and the contents of the Vendidad. M. Darmesteter's method is that of the traditional school, but not exclu-

sively so. In this we cannot but agree with him; but as he proceeds he seems to trust too much to the latest traditions. As far as regards the formation of the Zend Avesta, M. Darmesteter's system may be summed up in three points:—The Avesta is the work of the magi of Media; it was compiled under the Parthian kings, and its last edition was brought out under the Sassanides; Aderbâd Mahraspand was its author. We are quite in accord with the author as regards the first point, for we were the first to maintain this theory in our "Studies on the Avesta" (Paris: Leroux, 1877). From the second point, however, we must express our dissent. M. Darmesteter brings forward to support his theory the authority of Hamzah of Ispahan, who affirms, if we may believe our author, the identity of the religion of the Parthian kings with that of the Sassanides. Now there is, in reality, no such statement. The passage in Hamzah cited by M. Darmesteter says something quite different—namely, that the religious principles of the first Sassanidæ did not differ from those of the Persian Satraps (*reguli Persiæ*), whom he subjugated. (See "Hamzah," Gothwald's Translation, p. 32.) Through the whole chapter devoted to the Sassanides not a word is said of the Parthian kings.

M. Darmesteter relies also upon a remark of Dinkart. According to the Pahlavi book, a *Valkash* (Vologeses) had collected all the fragments of the Avesta that had escaped the hands of the satellites of Alexander. The quotation this time is correct. Dinkart, however, attributes a work of the same kind to Darius; and further, he supposes that the Avesta and the Pahlavi version were already in existence in the time of the Achæmenidæ. His testimony, therefore, is of no value. As to *Aderbad*, his work may include the Pahlavi version and its glosses, but it certainly does not bear upon the Avesta.

The theory of M. Darmesteter with regard to the origin of the Avestian religion is well known. It is the extreme of mythologism, or rather in its highest expression. The author himself formulates the principle in these terms:—"Every religious belief and practice proceeds from some myth," as if myths did not necessarily presuppose some already existing religious belief.

As to the Avestian religion, according to M. Darmesteter it does not constitute either a reform or a change of religion. It is the natural and gradual development of the Aryan myths. Ahura Mazda—god, spiritual, eternal, infinitely wise and pure, creator of heaven and earth—is but a natural development of the physical heaven, vivified by superstition. The principle of evil, the author of all evils, is but the demon of the storm, magnified or exaggerated. In another place—if the Mazdayasnians, revelling in all sorts of things contrary to nature, in order to purify themselves, plunge into an unclean bath of the urine of the ox—it is because in a *certain mythology* rain was metaphorically described as the urine of an immense bull. If the dog in the Avesta is made almost the equal of man, if its wrongs are avenged almost to the same extent as those of man, it is because a Hindu poet had already imagined the sending forth of a dog that was divine in quest of the clouds stolen by the demons.

But we will not dwell longer on this subject. We have treated it in detail in our "Origin of Zoroastrianism" (Paris: Leroux), and in the preface to the second edition of our translation of the Avesta, to which we may refer our readers.

In conclusion, we must express our regret that we have not been able more favourably to criticise a work which we would gladly have praised, and on the appearance of which great hopes were founded.

C. DE HARLEZ.

Introduction to the Science of Language. By A. H. SAYCE, Deputy-Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford. In Two Volumes. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co.

PROFESSOR SAYCE is one of the few scholars produced by our English Universities who can be said to have attained a European reputation. He is, in point of fact, more than a scholar—he is a *savant*; the compeer of the Bréals and Lenormants, the Rasks and Steinthals, the Pictets and Spiegels of the Continent. The colleague of Professor Max Müller in the school of Comparative Philology at Oxford, he, in the main, follows the method of that eminent man, of whom he is, to some extent, the pupil, and to whom he is little, if at all, inferior either in learning or in power of generalisation. But Professor Sayce is no mere repeater of the discoveries and speculations of other men. While quite devoid of that delusive desire for the reputation of originality which, issuing oftenest in mere paradox, is the bane of so many men of real ability, he never takes on trust a theory however specious, nor adopts a nude hypothesis upon the mere strength of a great name. Without underrating authority, he is "nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri." His writings are as signal an example of modest independence as they are of wide and patient research and critical sagacity.

Professor Sayce's object in the work before us is to give a systematic account of the science of language, its nature, its progress, and its aims. He begins by discussing the various theories of language which have been propounded to the world, and then proceeds to inquire into the nature of human speech—with remarks upon the principal causes which bring about changes in it, namely: imitation, emphasis, and laziness. Then follows a chapter on Phonology and Sematology; and next, one in which the Morphology of Speech, the Metaphysics of Language, and Comparative Syntax are dealt with. Such are the contents of the first volume. The second opens with a chapter on Roots, and then proceeds to a genealogical classification of languages. The Inflectional Families of Speech, and the Agglutinative, Incorporating, Polysynthetic and Isolating tongues, are next passed in review; and finally, Comparative Mythology, the Science of Religion, the Origin of Language, and the relation of the Science of Language to Ethnology, Logic, and Education are considered. A selected list of works for the student, and a very full and copious index close the work.

It is manifest that in such a notice as that to which we are here restricted anything like adequate criticism of a book of which the scope is such as we have described, would be impossible. All we can do is to indicate generally the learned author's point of view, and to point out some of the main lines which he follows. The rise of a real Science of Language he dates from the last century, the older Etymology, instead of being what it professed to be, *ετυμο-λογία*, the science of truth, having been little more than the science of falsehood, and mere guesswork. Leibnitz, he points out, prepared the way for the true method by overthrowing the belief that Hebrew was the original language from which all others are to be traced,—Hebrew being, in fact, as all the world now knows, merely a Semitic dialect—while the discovery of Sir William Jones, that Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin have sprung from the same common source, entitles him to be remembered as the pioneer of comparative philology. The work of the Spanish Jesuit missionary, Don Lorenzo Hervás, entitled "*Catalogo delle Lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinità a diversità* (1784)," was a valuable step in the right direction; and Herder made the rise of an historical science possible by substituting the idea of development for that of uniform sequence in history. "It was a poet, Friedrich Schlegel, however, and not a philologist, who first laid down the great fact that the languages of India, Persia, Greece, Italy, Germany, and Slavonia, form but one family, daughters of the same mother, and heirs of the same wealth of words and flections. Schlegel learnt Sanskrit while in England, during the peace of Amiens (1801–1802), and to his work on 'The Language and Wisdom of the Indians,' published in 1808, may be traced the foundation of the science of language. All that was now required was some master-scholar who should continue the work begun by Schlegel, and establish on a deep and firm basis the edifice that he had reared. This master-scholar was found in Francis Bopp."

Bopp then was the true founder of comparative philology, and the numerous scholars who have devoted their lives to this subject since his day have but built upon his foundations and carried on his work. It is worth while to quote a page from Professor Sayce's book in which he gives a summary of what has been accomplished by the most distinguished of those who have followed that great genius:—

Bopp's work was confined to the more strictly scientific and inductive side of comparative philology, to the comparison of words and forms, and the conclusions we may infer therefrom: the metaphysical side of the science of language found an able expositor in Wilhelm von Humboldt. Starting with the new method of Bopp, Humboldt revised the old endeavours to found a philosophy of speech, and extended the results obtained by Bopp to all the manifold languages of the world. In a number of publications, more especially the introduction of his great work on the Kawi language of Java, which came out after his death in 1836, he dealt with the various problems raised by the science and philosophy of language, and not only sketched the general outlines of a true philosophy of speech, but also threw out suggestions which have since borne abundant fruit in the hands of other scholars. Humboldt's

work was followed up by Steinthal, whose journal, the "*Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft*," conducted with the help of Lazarus, has proved a treasury of suggestive thought to a whole generation of linguistic scholars. Bopp, on the other hand, was followed by Pott, whose vast knowledge and genial insight are probably unequalled among the students of language. His "*Etymologische Forschungen*," in spite of its size and want of an adequate index, is a mine of philological wealth, and his works on the "*Language of the Gipsies*" (1846), on "*Proper Names*" (1856), and on the "*Quinary and Vigesimal Systems of Numeration*" (1847), have largely helped the progress of linguistic science. In the "*Anti-Kaulen*," or "*Mythical Representations of the Origin of Peoples and Languages*" (1865), and "*The Inequality of the Races of Men*" (1856), where a great display of anthropological knowledge is made, Pott did good service in checking the unifying haste of a young science. While Humboldt and Pott were laying broad and deep the foundations of the new science of language, Jacob Grimm was applying the method of Bopp in another and more special direction. Instead of endeavouring to grasp the whole vast range of languages, or even those of the Aryan group alone, he devoted himself to the minute and scientific study of one branch of them only, and his "*Deutsche Grammatik*" (1819-1837) ushered in a new epoch in the history of comparative philology. Benfey, indeed, still carried on with a master's power the labours begun by Bopp and Pott, but he too had by degrees to adapt himself to the spirit of the time, and the fame he has acquired as a Sanskrit scholar, far outshines that acquired by his brilliant but ineffectual attempt to reduce the Aryan and Semitic families of speech to a single stem, or by his "*History of the Study of Language, and of Oriental Philology in Germany, since the beginning of the sixteenth century*" (1869). The time was come for a microscopic rather than a telescopic view of language and languages; the broad outlines of linguistic science had been sketched by its first founders, and what was now wanted was, to fill up the details, to apply the general principles of the science to special cases, and, by a close and accurate study of particular languages and dialects, either to confirm or to overthrow the conclusions at which they had arrived. No single man can know thoroughly more than a few languages at the most; for the rest he must be content to trust to the report of others: and however great may be his genius, however wide-reaching his vision, unless the materials he uses have already been sifted and arranged in the light of the comparative method, his most important inferences are likely to be vitiated. Hence the value of the work begun by Grimm, and of the direction in which he turned the course of scientific philology. Erasmus Rask, the Dane, followed up the example thus set with an investigation of the northern languages of Europe, and his researches into the language of the Zend-Avesta, the first ever undertaken by an European scholar, formed the scaffold upon which Eugène Burnouf erected the colossal structure of Zend philology. Burnouf did for Zend and Achaemenian Persian what Grimm had done for the Teutonic languages; his work has been continued by Lassen, Haug, Spiegel, Justi, and others. Meanwhile, the Romance languages were taken in hand by Diez, whose "*Comparative Grammar*" (1836) and "*Comparative Dictionary*" (1853) are masterpieces of method and insight. Indeed, they may be said to have created Romance philology altogether. The philology of the Celtic dialects was set on a scientific footing by our own countryman, Prichard, and above all by Zeuss and Stokes, while Miklosich and Schleicher did the same for the Slavonic tongues. Along with his special labours in Slavonic, Schleicher carried on the tradition of a wider and more general

treatment of the whole Indo-European family itself, and his "Compendium of Comparative Grammar" (1861-2), in which he endeavoured to restore the grammar of the parent Aryan speech, will ever remain a monument of learning and genius. Schleicher also came forward as the representative of the view which includes the science of language among the physical sciences, and his works, whatever may be thought of the theory that underlies them, have done much to further the progress of linguistic study (vol. i. p. 53).

For a long time comparative philology was practically synonymous with the comparative treatment of the Aryan tongues only. But gradually it was discovered that the principles applicable to these are inapplicable to other languages and dialects. The parent Aryan tongue has no claim to be considered the primitive language of mankind. "The Aryan group is an exceptional one, and the laws determined from it, so far from being of universal validity, do not apply even to the dialects of the Semitic family." Professor Friederich Müller reckons a hundred families of languages, between which science can discover no connection or relationship. Professor Sayce would apparently reduce the number to seventy-six (vol. ii. p. 64). "The Aryan languages," our author writes—

are the languages of a civilized race: the parent-speech to which we may inductively trace them back was spoken by men who stood on a relatively high level of culture, and was as fully developed, as inflectional, in short, as Sanskrit or Latin themselves. Such a speech can tell us far less of the early condition of languages than the Bushman dialects of our own day, and to make the conclusions derived from the examination of it of universal validity or so many revelations of the primitive state of speech, would be a serious error. The exceptional character of the Aryan group of languages has been made apparent by the application of the method learnt from its investigation to other groups of tongues. The four most important groups which have yet been examined are the Malay-Polynesian, as explored by W. von Humboldt, Buschmann, Von der Gabelentz, and Friederich Müller; the Bantu of Southern Africa, the scientific investigation of which is due to Bleek; the Athapasian and Sonorian of North America, of which Buschmann has been the Bopp; and, above all, the Ural-Altaic, otherwise called the Ugro-Altaic, or Turanian, which is now, owing to a variety of circumstances, receiving a special attention. The work begun by Castrén, Schott, Böttlingk, and Max Müller, has been continued by Boller, Budenz, Donner, Hunfálvy, Ahlgrist, Thomsen, Ujfalvy, Schiefner, and others; and so far at all events, as the Finnic group is concerned, "Turanian" philology is almost as far advanced as Aryan philology itself (vol. i. p. 57).

Let us quote yet another passage: that with which the first chapter concludes.

Philological opinion is still divided upon certain points. But such division of opinion is a healthy sign of life and progress in the new science. It is only by the conflict and discussion of theories that truth can finally be reached, and the many controversies excited by the science of language show how broadly and deeply the foundations of the science are being laid. On the phonological side the progress has been greatest, and most certain; morphology and the investigation of roots still lag behind; comparative

syntax is but beginning to be handled; and sematology, the science of meanings, has hardly been touched. But the method inaugurated by Bopp remains unshaken; the main conclusions he arrived at hold their ground, and the existence of the Aryan family of speech, with all its consequences, is one of the facts permanently acquired for science. True there are many questions still to be settled. It is still disputed whether the science of language is a historical or a physical one; whether language is an independent organism obeying fixed and necessary laws of its own, or an "institution" controllable by the will of man; whether phonology is to exclude all other departments of the science when the nature of the latter is discussed; whether roots ever constituted a real language, or are merely the ultimate elements into which words may be decomposed; whether the flecational stage of language springs from the agglutinative, and this again from the isolating; whether the languages of the world are the selected residuum of infinite attempts at speech, or have flowed from one or two common sources; whether dialects precede languages, or languages dialects; whether conceptual thought has created language, or language has created conceptual thought; whether, finally, the word or the sentence is the true unit of speech. But with all this diversity of opinion there is a yet greater unanimity. There is no scientific philologist who doubts the indispensable value of phonology and the absolute strictness of its laws; who questions the axiom that roots are the ultimate elements of articulate speech, the barrier between man and brute, and that no etymology is worth anything which does not repose upon them; who would compare the words of one family of speech with the words of another in the easy-going fashion of a præscientific age; or who would shut his eyes to the light already shed on the history of the human mind, and the riddle of mythology, by the study of the records of speech. Language is the reflection of the thoughts and beliefs of communities from their earliest days; and by tracing its changes and its fortunes by discovering the origin and history of words and their meanings, we can read those thoughts and beliefs with greater certainty and minuteness than they had been traced by the pen of the historian, or even if

Supera bellum et funera Troie

... alias alii quoque res cecinere poetæ (vol. i. p. 89).

The questions here glanced at are treated by Professor Sayce with more or less fulness in his subsequent chapters. From much which he advances we are obliged to dissent. Sometimes he is wrong historically, as when, for example, he tells us (vol. ii. p. 288) that "Mohammedanism professed to be a protest against the Christian idolatry of the sixth century." As a matter of mere fact, apart from all theories, Mahommedanism did not profess to be anything of the kind. Sometimes he appears to adopt conclusions too hastily. For instance, he speaks of the meaning of the word "Nirvana" as having been "exactly" settled. Surely this is cutting the Gordian knot. Professor Childers, Professor Max Müller, and Mr. Rhys Davids, to speak only of a few authorities out of many who have discoursed upon the word in question, have thrown great light upon it. But so far are they from having settled its exact meaning, that perhaps the safest conclusion derivable from their discussions is the impossibility of a precise definition of it. Buddhists themselves hold it to be a mystery—a thing which passeth the understanding of ordinary men—which only the perfectly

enlightened intellect of a Buddha can comprehend. Into the graver matters upon which we differ from Professor Sayce we will not enter. In every page of his work we feel the ethos of Protestantism, which of course is natural enough in the case of a Protestant writer who honestly and logically follows out his principles. But this must not make us unjust to the author. It is the saying of a wise and virtuous man, "In our greatest differences and in proportion as our convictions are deep and serious, let us not be afraid to be equitable, considerate, generous;" and no one, we think, can peruse Professor Sayce's work without learning much from it, and without feeling that the words of Montaigne fully apply to it: "C'est icy lecteurs, un livre de bonne foy."

W. S. L.

A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology and Religion, Geography, History, and Literature. By JOHN DOWSON, M.R.A.S., late Professor Hindustani, Staff College. London: Trübner & Co.

HELPS for the student of the language and literature of the East are multiplying apace, and no one in this country—perhaps in any country—has a stronger claim upon his gratitude than the publishing house of Messrs. Trübner.

Quæ regio in terris nostri nou plena laboris

might serve as an appropriate motto for the catalogue of their linguistic publications, but the tongues, both classical and vulgar, of our Eastern possessions have been their especial field; and it is to their indefatigable enterprise that we in no small degree owe it, if, in pursuing our researches in Sanskrit and Pāli, in the Dravidian or Hindi dialects, in Singhalese and Burmese, we can proceed swiftly and securely, where some twenty or thirty years ago people were obliged to grope their way in a hesitating and tentative manner.

We have upon several occasions drawn attention to the important Oriental series which Messrs. Trübner planned a short time ago, and have noticed some of the more remarkable volumes which have already appeared in it. Mr. Dowson's "Hindu Classical Dictionary," which is now before us, is not a production which can claim the same rank as Dr. Haug's "Essays on the Parsis," or Professor Weber's "History of Indian Literature," or Bishop Bigandet's "Legend of Gaudama." As the author modestly intimates, it "is derived entirely from the productions of European scholars," and aims at being a summary, gleaned from many sources, of the present condition of our knowledge respecting the religion and mythology of ancient India. But unpretending as Mr. Dowson's volume is, it is not easy to speak too highly of its practical utility. He has brought together a vast amount of information, for which the student must previously have gone to many different sources; and the value of the time which would have been spent in hunting through Max Müller or Muir, Wilson or Monier Williams, Lassen or Weber, Röth or Böhthlingk, is the measure of the value of this book. As far as we have been able to test Mr. Dowson's work, he is as accurate as he is diligent. Perhaps we could

occasionally desire that his information had been a little fuller. But no doubt it was an object with him to restrict, as far as possible, the dimensions of his volume. He acknowledges in his preface that the book "would be more valuable and interesting if it were illustrated with plates and cuts," and laments that the expense of such illustrations "would be too heavy to be at once ventured upon." We trust that the work may be sufficiently well received to warrant these adjuncts to a future edition. There is one class of students, in particular, to whom Mr. Dowson's book will be especially useful—those who are preparing for missionary work in India. Mr. Matthew Arnold somewhere remarks that "to any one who weighs the matter well, the missionary in clerical coat and gaiters, whom one sees in woodcuts, preaching to a group of picturesque Orientals, is, from his inadequacy of his criticism, both of his hearers' religion and his own, a hardly less grotesque object in his intellectual equipment for his task than in his outward attire." Mr. Arnold, indeed, has here in view Protestant missionaries; but Catholics, no less than Protestants, would do well to obtain a just conception of the systems which they seek to overthrow by way of preparation for their enterprise.

Metrical Translations from Sanskrit Writers, with an Introduction. Many Prose Versions and Parallel Passages from Classical Authors. By J. MUIR, C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., Ph.D. London: Trübner. 1879.

THIS is another volume of Messrs. Trübner's Oriental Series, and to the general reader it is likely to be among the most attractive of those which have as yet appeared in that collection. Mr. Muir's object is to present in English some of the best sentiments which are found in Sanskrit writers, and he has wisely given metrical form to the passages he has chosen, at the same time appending prose versions of almost literal exactness. In some cases, too, he has quoted the context where that course seemed desirable for bringing out more fully the author's meaning; and he has also cited largely from the Greek and Latin classics, by way of parallel or illustration. As specimens of his translations, we will give a few of his verses. First, take these on "True Piety and Righteousness, and their Fruits:"—

With awe sincere the gods adore,
Meet honour to thy tutor show;
With gifts enrich the good, and so
In heaven enduring treasure store.
Thy pious acts perform apart:
A love for goodness scorn to feign,
And never as a means of gain
Parade it with self-seeking art.

The passage thus versified is from the *Māhābhārata*, and runs literally as follows:—

"A man should worship the gods with sincerity, and should serve his *guru* (teacher) honestly, and lay up treasure in the next world. Let him practice righteousness alone, and not make pretences to it.

In the following verses the lesson taught is, that he is the true Brahman who follows after virtue :—

The Sūdra pure in all his ways,
Who all his passions sternly sways,
The same respect can rightly claim
As he who bears the Brahman's name.
So Brahmā ruled, and he well knew
To mete to every class its due.

When worthy acts, a nature sound,
Are both in any Sūdra found,
He surely merits more esteem
Than worthless Brahmins ;—so I deem.

Nor birth, nor hallowing rites, nor store,
However vast, of sacred lore
Can make a Brahman : naught avails
For this, if virtuous conduct fails.

Good conduct constitutes a man
A Brahman : naught else ever can.
And Sūdras, too, whose lives are pure,
The rank of Brahmanhood secure.

Brahmanic nature shows no change,
Wherever found, in all its range.
That man a Brahman deem in whom,
Exempt from goodness, passion, gloom,
The stainless Brahma dwells, serene ;—
None else deserves the name, I ween.

This is also taken from the Māhābhārata, and must sound strangely in the ears of a modern Brahman. The prose version runs thus :—

For pure acts a pure-minded Sūdra, who subdues his senses, should be honoured as a Brahman. Such is the doctrine revealed by Brahma. The Sūdra in whom a virtuous nature and virtuous actions are found, is to be esteemed more excellent than a Brahman. Such is my opinion. (Mahādeva is the speaker.) Neither birth, nor initiation, nor learning, nor progeny (descent?) are the causes of Brahmanhood. Good conduct alone creates it. All this class of Brahmins in the world is only constituted such by virtuous conduct ; and a Sūdra who continues to conduct himself virtuously attains to Brahmanhood. I consider that the Brahmanical nature is the same everywhere. He in whom the pure Brahma, devoid of qualities (goodness, passion, darkness), resides, is a Brahman.

One more extract, and it is a very striking one :—

DRAUPADI speaks :—

Beholding noble men distrest,
Ignoble men enjoying good,
Thy righteous self by woe pursued,
Thy wicked foe by fortune blest,
I charge the Lord of all—the strong,
The partial Lord—with doing wrong.
His dark, mysterious, sovereign will
To men their several lots decrees ;
He favours some with wealth and ease,
Some dooms to every form of ill.

As puppets' limbs the touch obey
Of him whose fingers hold the strings,
So God directs the secret springs
Which all the deeds of creatures sway.

In vain those birds which springes hold
Would seek to fly: so man, a thrall,
Fast fettered ever lives, in all
He does or thinks by God controlled.

As trees from river banks are riven
And swept away when rains have swelled
The streams, so man by time impelled
To action, helpless, on are driven.

God does not show for all mankind
A parent's love, and wise concern;
But acts like one unfeeling, stern,
Whose eyes caprice and passion blind.

YUDHISHTHIRA *replies* :—

I've listened, loving spouse, to thee,
I've marked thy charming, kind discourse,
Thy phrases turned with grace and force,
But know, thou utterest blasphemy.

I never act to earn reward;
I do what I am bound to do,
Indifferent whether fruit accrue;
My duty I alone regard.

Of all the men who care profess
For virtue—love of that to speak—
The unworthiest far are those who seek
To make a gain of righteousness.

Who thus—to every lofty sense
Of duty dead—from each good act,
Its full return would fain extract;—
He forfeits every recompense.

Love duty, thus, for duty's sake,
Not careful what return it brings:
Yet doubt not, bliss from virtue springs,
While woe shall sinners overtake.

By ships the perilous sea is crossed;
So men on virtue's stable bark
Pass o'er this mundane ocean dark,
And reach the blessed heavenly coast.

If holy actions bore no fruits;
If self-command, beneficence,
Received no fitting recompense;
Then men would lead the life of brutes.

Who then would knowledge toil to gain?
Or after noble aims aspire?
O'er all the earth delusion dire
And darkness deep and black would reign.

But 'tis not so; for saints of old
Well knew that every righteous deed
From God obtains its ample meed:
They, therefore, strove pure lives to lead,
As ancient sacred books have told.

The gods—for such their sovereign will—
Have veiled from our too curious ken,
The laws by which the deeds of men
Are recompensed with good and ill.

No common mortal comprehends
The wondrous power, mysterious skill,
With which these Lords of all fulfil
Their high designs, their hidden ends.

These secret things, those saints descry
Alone, whose sinless life austere
For them has earned an insight clear,
To which all mysteries open lie.

So let thy doubts like vapours flee,
Abandon impious unbelief;
And let not discontent and grief
Disturb thy soul's serenity.

But study God aright to know,
That highest Lord of all revere,
Whose grace on those who love him here
Will endless future bliss bestow.

DRAUPADI rejoins:—

How could I God, the Lord of all,
Contemn, or dare His acts arraign,
Although I weakly thus complain?
Nor would I virtue bootless call.

I idly talk; my better mind
Is overcome by deep distress,
Which long shall yet my heart oppress,
So judge me rightly: thou art kind.

For the literal translation of the passages on which these verses are founded we must refer our readers to Mr. Muir's volume, as we have not space to quote it here. Before we put aside the book, we should observe that in the Introduction to it Mr. Muir gives us a dissertation wherein he discusses at considerable length the question whether the religious ideas of the Indians were influenced by the introduction of Christianity into India in the earlier centuries of our era, and whether any trace of such influence is to be found in the *Māhābhārata*. There can be no doubt that the *Māhābhārata* was composed before the beginning of our era; probably four or five centuries before; and that it subsequently received large additions at uncertain times. Among the additions is the portion known as the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, and it is in this portion that the passages supposed to be borrowed, more or less, from the New Testament

occur. The conclusion Mr. Muir arrives at—and we think correctly—is identical with that expressed by Professor Monier Williams in the following passage of that very competent scholar's "Indian Wisdom":—

Dr. Lorinser, expanding the views of Professor Weber and others, concerning the influence of Christianity on the legends of Krishna, thinks that many of the sentiments of the Bhagavad-Gītā have been directly borrowed from the New Testament, copies of which, he thinks, found their way into India about the third century, when he believes the poem to have been written. . . . He seems, however, to forget that fragments of truth are to be found in all religious systems, however false, and that the Bible, though a true revelation, is still, in regard to the human mind, through which the thoughts are transfused, a thoroughly Oriental book cast in an Oriental mould, and full of Oriental ideas and expressions. Some of his comparisons seem mere coincidences of language, which might occur quite naturally and independently. In other cases, where he draws attention to coincidences of ideas—as, for example, the division of the sphere of self-control into thought, word, and deed, in chap. xviii. 14–16; and of good works into prayer, fasting, and almsgiving—how could these be borrowed from Christianity, when they are also found in Manu, which few will place later than the fifth century B.C.?

The Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes, and Christians. By ERNEST DE BUNSEN. London: Longmans & Co. 1880.

WE are at a loss how to review this book. We must begin with a candid confession that we have utterly failed in the attempt to read it through, though we have read quite enough to feel sure that the author's idea of reasoning is completely different from ours.

M. Bunsen, so far as we understand him, maintains that the Buddhists believed in an Angel-Messiah, that the Essenes borrowed this tenet from them, and finally that St. Stephen and St. Paul derived it from the Essenes, and propagated it in the Christian Church.

On the part of the book which treats of the Buddhists, we can form no opinion, for we do not know enough of the subject to test M. Bunsen's assertions. But as to the Essenes, there is no proof that they entertained any special Messianic idea of any sort, nor does M. Bunsen furnish one shred of evidence that they believed in an Angel-Messiah. But what proof is there, the reader will ask, that St. Paul derived his doctrine on the Messias from the Essenes, even supposing that the Essenes had any particular teaching on the matter? We will give a specimen of the way in which M. Bunsen answers this question: "During the three years," he says (p. 232), "spent by St. Paul in Arabia, after his conversion by Ananias (the Essene) to the Christian-Essenic faith, Saul may have passed through the Essenic noviciate of three years, as Josephus seems to have done with Banus. As initiated Essene, Paul would have been bound by oath not to speak the 'hidden wisdom' to others than the perfect or initiated."

On this we must remark (1) there is no shadow of reason for suppos-

ing that Ananias ever had been an Essene. M. Bunsen assumes without the least proof that he is identical with an Ananias mentioned by Josephus, but there is no ground for thinking even that the other Ananias was an Essene. (2) It is not certain that St. Paul was three years in Arabia; (3) the Essenic noviciate in Arabia is a pure invention. M. Bunsen might as well dispense with the Essenes altogether, and say that St. Paul met a Buddhist teacher at the foot of Mount Sinai.

The style in which the book is written is most obscure. We have been disappointed even in the hope of picking up a few interesting facts, for M. Bunsen, so far as we have been able to test him, is no less inaccurate than fanciful. The book is a striking example of the aberrations possible to the human mind, but this, so far as we can judge, is its only value.

W. E. ADDIS.

Dogmatische Theologie. Von Dr. J. B. HEINRICH, Domdecan, Generalvicar, und Professor der Dogmatik am bischoeflichen Seminar zu Mainz. Mainz: Kirchheim. Vol. I., 1873; Vol. II., 1876; Vol. III., 1879. (Dogmatic Theology. By Dr. Heinrich.)

SINCE the great event of the Œcumenical Vatican Council, Catholic Germany has witnessed the publication of several excellent textbooks of dogmatic theology. We may mention the works of Glossner, Hurter, and the great work of Professor Scheeben of Cologne. Dr. Heinrich's book seems to call for a special notice. Two great prerogatives distinguish it—admirable clearness of ideas and language, and a thorough explanation of the subjects treated. The author, who for upwards of twenty-five years has enjoyed the reputation of being one of the most able lecturers and speakers in Catholic Germany, purposed to publish such a dogmatic work as would complete the student's lessons, help the missionary clergy to keep up, amidst their hard work, the study of theology—a study which never ought to be superseded—and finally would present to the cultivated layman an attractive and useful repertory of theological knowledge. Immense as may be the progress made by mankind in our days in the cultivation of separate sciences, it cannot be denied that a terrible want of the higher principles—the spiritual bond holding together single parts—is spreading almost everywhere. As in the natural order of sciences, metaphysics may be styled the queen, to whom the other sciences must be subservient—so in the supernatural order it is theology, or, to speak more accurately, dogmatic theology, which sways the sceptre. It was so in old Catholic times; and dogmatic theology would still hold this noble position but for the Reformation, and the French Revolution, and the disastrous consequences therefrom to both Church and State. Hence, Dr. Heinrich goes back to the fathers and great scholastics, bringing out the treasures hidden in their works, and presenting them in a shape more attractive to the nineteenth century. He borrows also

his method from this undefined source. For Catholic theology, very appropriately remarks our author, a new method has not to be invented : it is only incumbent on the present generation to construct their edifice on those solid, unwavering foundations that were laid centuries ago. And since theology cannot be duly treated without extensive knowledge of Christian philosophy, Dr. Heinrich largely employs the philosophy of St. Thomas. Nay, a very great part of the first book may be called purely philosophical. For this, perhaps, fault may be found with the author; but considering that his principal aim is to give a dogmatic theology fit to be used by cultivated Catholics of various classes, we must thank him for quoting so largely from philosophy.

The first volume opens with an introduction on the idea of theology, the relation between philosophy and theology, theology as science and wisdom, and the qualities requisite for its proper treatment (pp. 1-107). The two latter chapters are well worth perusing. Theology is the most sublime of all sciences; hence is also wisdom and the most perfect image of the increated wisdom of God. And as theology is necessarily and simultaneously "*theologia mentis et cordis*," the theologian must be endowed with science, faith, and a good intention. The first book explains the "*praeambula fidei*." We may call attention to the refutation of modern errors about the "*praeambula fidei*" (pp. 205-214), and to the splendid apology of the Christian religion drawn from the person, life, and works of our Divine Lord (pp. 440-472). The second book comments on faith; its nature, fountains, rule, &c. Here our author makes ample use of the opportunity afforded him of meeting a special necessity of our time, in which the false principle of man's independence is a source of so much calamity. Many false systems have appeared even within the Church under the unhappy influence of modern anti-Christian philosophy. And these Dr. Heinrich refutes by irrefutably showing that the act of faith is free, virtuous, and supernatural; whereas Hermes supposed it to be *extorted* by the motive of credibility. The Catholic doctrine of inspiration has been fully developed and absolutely established by the Vatican Council. Hence several modern theories started in Germany concerning inspiration had to be given up. Catholic divines in the time of, and immediately subsequent to, the Reformation felt obliged to oppose a kind of bibliolatry, by bringing into prominence the necessity of tradition; whereas at the present day they are urged to insist on the inspiration and interior perfection of Holy Writ against the rationalism that disclaims the authority of the Bible.

The second volume concludes the doctrine concerning faith by treating on—1. tradition, its criteria and documents (pp. 3-147); 2. infallible office of teaching and deciding bestowed on the Church (pp. 163-632); and finally, we have in the third book an essay on the relation between revelation and science. As Protestants, on hearing the word "*tradition*," are led at once to think of legends, or a tradition resting on merely human support and liable to error, Dr. Heinrich expatiates fully on Catholic tradition: its immense difference from

human tradition, and he explains the various ways in which a doctrine may become the object of divine tradition. He contends that only those truths, commandments, and institutions which derive their origin from divine revelation, are objects of the "traditio divina," and it matters not whether they have been given by Christ to the Apostles, or revealed by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost to the Apostles as organs of divine revelation. The present day conflict against the claims of the Holy See fully justifies our author in commenting as thoroughly as he does on the infallibility of the Pope in teaching doctrine and morals. He points out the *extent* of this gift, showing that it covers not only supernatural truth as considered in itself, but also those facts which are connected so intimately with it, that the Church, without deciding on these facts, could not pass a judgment on the doctrines themselves. As specimen facts of this kind, our author mentions the approbation of religious orders (p. 644), and the canonization of saints (p. 646-650). In explaining the doctrine of theological conclusions he duly distinguishes between conclusions derived from two premises immediately revealed by God, and theological conclusions derived from premises of which one is divinely revealed, and the other a truth known by natural reason. He justifies the Church in establishing conclusions of the second kind by her infallible judgment; but he answers the question, "whether such definitions of the Church are an object of divine faith, or only of a certain persuasion founded on the divine faith as to the Church's infallibility?" by referring to the expression "tenere" used by the Vatican Council.

Hence he believes that there may be such a certain persuasion founded on faith in the Church's infallibility that has not the character of divine faith in the strict sense of the word. In saying this, our author deviates from the great leader Suarez, and places himself on the side of Molina. The third book goes on to explain the relation between philosophy and theology. The disastrous principle, that what in philosophy is true may be false in theology, defended in the Middle Ages by the Arabian philosophers, afterwards supported by Pomponatius and propounded with extreme onesidedness by modern sophists, is admirably refuted, and the Catholic doctrine, that truth (natural) cannot contradict truth (revealed), fully established. The best philosophy that can be employed by the Catholic divine is that of S. Thomas, but, "on the other side we never ought to forget that, as in theology, so also, and still more, in philosophy, a progress is possible and necessary (pp. 733-734).

The first and second volumes have an apologetical character, but the third volume introduces us into the sanctuary of theology. It treats of God, His existence, essence and qualities (pp. 18-884). Well worth reading is the first part, in which Dr. Heinrich opens the campaign against the modern false systems of pantheism, idealism, traditionalism and ontologism. They are literally crushed under the mighty strokes of his hammer. As to the refutation of ontologism, we should like to make one remark. This system is certainly a false

and dangerous one, our knowledge of God not being implanted, but, on the contrary, founded on the principle of causality. But is there not a world within us, and does not the examination of this world help us to know God, as well as the aspect of the visible world? One of the most important chapters is that treating on divine cognition (p. 533, 6 ff.). Here we at once come on the great question of "scientia media." With delicate circumspection and dexterity our author brings before us the opinions defended for 300 years in the two great schools of Thomists and Molinists. He declines to give his own opinion now, reserving it for the treatise on divine grace. We may be allowed to object to this proceeding, both in our own interest and far more in the interest of the student who always likes definite conclusions.

Dr. Heinrich will require three or four more volumes for the completion of his labours if he treats the remaining portions of theology on the same large scale. Catholic science is deeply indebted to him; he has, with ability equal to that of any of his contemporaries, explained and defended dogmatic truth in language that for simplicity and clearness is unrivalled in German literature.

BELLESHEIM.

Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte. Von JOSEPH CARDINAL HERGENRÖTHER. Erster Band, 1876; Zweiter Band, 1877; Supplement Band, 1880. Freiburg: Herder.

OF the numerous German Catholic scholars of our day there is not another to be found whose elaborate writings have so well deserved of the Church, by the defence of her rights and interests, and principally of the prerogatives of the Holy See, as Professor, now Cardinal, Hergenröther. Undoubtedly he is the most able pupil of Dr. Döllinger, but a pupil who has far surpassed his "maestro." Professor Hergenröther won for himself from the first the admiration and confidence of Catholic Germany by his excellent book on the "Kirchenstaat seit der französischen Revolution," in which he thoroughly treats of not only the external relations and vicissitudes of Rome and the Patrimony of St. Peter, but also, and principally, of the religious, social, and agricultural condition of the people. He may claim a special merit for his fair exposition of the state of the Pontifical financial system, which he unanswerably defended against those unsound and malign attacks which were launched against it at that time both in England and Germany. The *Civiltà Cattolica* called this book the most perfect comment on this delicate question, and declared itself impressed with admiration of the immense diligence of the author in accumulating and digesting masses of statistics and details.

In his work on the origin of the Greek schism, Professor Hergenröther next came forward as the defender of the same Holy See that had been slanderously taunted by Dr. Pichler with having given rise to that lamentable separation. In order to do his work

thoroughly, the learned Professor visited the principal European libraries, and was occupied for several years in searching for, and examining into, the most important manuscripts bearing on Photius and the deplorable influence he exercised on the Church of Constantinople. Three bulky volumes were published in 1867-1869 by Hergenröther on "Photius," in which our author fully succeeded in proving the fact that the Holy See, far from breaking up the unity of the two Churches, has always exerted its influence in order to bring them closer together. So far from the Holy See being blameworthy, the very first beginnings of the schism are to be traced to the intrigues of the learned, crafty, and ambitious patriarch, Photius. By this work Professor Hergenröther proved himself to be one of the best Greek scholars of our time. Curious to relate, this work has been welcomed even by Russian divines. Had he published only this work, he would have established his right to be ranked for ever with Baronius and Orsi. No sooner had Dr. Dollinger taken a not only doubtful but totally hostile position against Pius IX. and the Œcumenical Vatican Council, than Professor Hergenröther victoriously opposed him in several minor works, and lastly in his "Catholic Church and Christian State." This last was translated into Italian and also into English; hence any comment on it is here unnecessary.

It was Hergenröther's intention now to publish two other extensive books, one on Church and State, and the other on the history of the Catholic Church during the eighteenth century. All the materials necessary for carrying out this purpose were collected, when he was invited, or rather pressed and prevailed on by his friends, to give to the world his first "Handbook of General Ecclesiastical History." Only a few months ago this eminent work was completed; it is now therefore a duty incumbent on us to bring it before the English public; all the more, too, as the author's talents and merits have obtained a solemn recognition by his elevation to the sacred purple. Cardinal Hergenröther's method of writing the history of the Church is the very opposite to that of Dr. Dollinger, who seems to have forgotten the most simple and plain axioms of canon law and dogmatic theology. The Cardinal is as clever and solid a canonist and theologian as he is a historical writer. The principles to be adopted by writers of ecclesiastical history are laid down by him in the following words: "The essential ideas of historical pragmatism in ecclesiastical history have not to be now discovered; they exist, and are real; but to point them out more and more is the historian's most holy duty. Indeed, pragmatism could never be true and consistent, were the author to start from a certain philosophical system, or from a point of view lying *outside* and not inside the Church. The standard on which persons and facts are to be tested must be afforded by the Christian spirit; hence arises what we call impartiality. It consists in being destitute of personal and unfounded prejudices, and in endeavouring to describe persons and things as they really are; but impartiality does not at all abstract from every religious feeling or persuasion. That would be a mere impossibility."

The first volume, after an introduction describing the preparatory means employed by God for facilitating the spread of Christianity, opens with the period of Christian antiquity. This period is divided into two epochs—from the foundation of the Church to Constantine, and from Constantine to the Synod of Trullo (A.D. 692). Every epoch is commented on in various chapters that treat of the propagation of the faith, the war against heresies, Christian science and life, rites and constitution of the Church. The characteristics of the single periods and of leading personages are specially excellent, and deserving of attention; as, for example, "The Emperor Constantine" (I. p. 203), St. Gregory VII. (I. p. 738), and "Boniface VIII." (I. pp. 822-869). In his explanation of scholastic science, Cardinal Hergenröther shows himself to be one of the most solid theologians (I. pp. 946-986). The second volume deals with the history of the Church from the fourteenth century to 1879. In the first part the author finds ample opportunity for correcting a good many errors, handed down from one generation to another, regarding several Popes. Let me take John XXII., who for his ascetic life and deep learning, according to our author, ranks with the most excellent Pontiffs of any century. Most accurate and appropriate are his critical remarks on the so-called Council of Pisa: "Gregory XII. was—before the Council was convened—either legitimate Pope, or he was not. If he was the legitimate Pope, he could not cease so to be by the decree of an acephalous meeting; if he were not legitimate Pope, then neither were the Cardinals who elected Alexander VI. legitimate. . . . For deposing the Pope there did not exist any right. Gregory, had he really been breaking his promises, would have sinned, but by no means have lost his dignity. Did there not exist any right for deposing the Pope, there could not be a right for electing a successor" (II. p. 65). Perhaps most interest will be felt in the descriptions of the Reformation period (II. pp. 242-400); the counter-reformation, starting from the Council of Trent (II. pp. 409-512); and the events of our own time, from the French Revolution down to the Vatican Council. A chapter full of the most instructive details is that from pages 693-721, treating of "Unbelief and the preparation for the Revolution period."

Every author is subject to the old proverb, "*Tantum valet, quantum probat.*" Testing by this truth the work of Cardinal Hergenröther, we feel sure that any scholar perusing the third volume of his "*Handbook of Ecclesiastical History*" will be bound to rank him with the most excellent authors of ecclesiastical history. In a volume of five hundred and ninety-six pages we are led through the literature of nineteen hundred years; and a very storehouse of books is opened before us. The volume concludes with chronological tables and a general index. Cardinal Hergenröther has laid peculiar stress on adducing the testimony of the Greek Fathers, and especially of those who testify to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Considering the singularly high merits of this work, the vast extent of learning exhibited in it, the author's acquaintance with ancient and modern literature in its bearing on Church history, the accuracy of

his doctrinal statements, his familiarity with canon law, his burning zeal for the Catholic Church, for her supreme pastor, and for her great interests, one cannot but think it a pity that at the very moment when this work became complete an English translation of Alzog's Handbook was issued in English—a work that can in no way be compared with Hergenröther's. I trust the time is not far distant when some English scholar will be found to do as much for the introduction of Hergenröther to the English public as has been done for Alzog.

BELLESHEIM.

A Commentary on the Book of Job. With a Translation. By SAMUEL COX. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1880.

MR. COX tells us that it has been his aim to produce a "readable book," and to bring home the best results of modern scholarship to readers of ordinary intelligence who are unable to study Job in the original. In this most useful task he has certainly attained what we may fairly call a brilliant success. His commentary is eminently interesting, and we cannot think that, in spite of its faults in style and taste, many persons will begin to read his book without perusing it to the end with pleasure and profit; for Mr. Cox has studied Job long and carefully, and in a most religious spirit, and he has in a high degree the gift of imparting his ideas in clear and forcible language. He has, however, a higher ambition. He hopes that he has made an addition of "real value to the exegetical literature which has gathered round the sacred poem." We cannot think that this hope has been, at least to any considerable extent, fulfilled, but before we give our reasons for this judgment, we must try to explain the task which a commentator on the book of Job has to perform.

There are difficulties enough in the prophetic and poetical books of the Old Testament, but in Job difficulties of all kinds crowd together, as if in conspiracy to baffle the interpreter. Any one who has attempted the serious study of this sacred poem will understand St. Jerome's meaning, when he compares it to an eel, which seemed to slip out of his hands however hard he pressed it. First of all there is the difficulty of the language, and this difficulty is extreme. There is no book in the Hebrew Bible which, for number of words found nowhere else, can in any way compare with Job. With regard to a number of words we can, after all, only conjecture the exact meaning, and to the end of time scholars will differ about the precise force which attaches to them. Much has been done through comparison of cognate languages, particularly of Arabic. An immense debt is due to Jerome's translation, to which Canon Cook, one of the foremost among Protestant scholars, and one of the best commentators on Job, rightly attributes a "great value." Much is due to the labours of modern Semitic scholars, from Schultens in 1737, to Ewald and Delitzsch in our own day. Gesenius, who once intended to write a commentary on Job, has discussed every difficult passage in the book with wonderful clearness and brevity, in his Thesaurus. Mr. Cox is very severe on the way

in which his predecessors in the exposition of Job have accumulated references, and given long catenas of opinions on the meaning of hard words. But we think this criticism rests on a misunderstanding. Perhaps, for most educated persons ignorant of Hebrew, it is best to take the rendering of some eminent scholar, and not to trouble themselves much about differences of opinion on details. But a scholar, or any one who wishes to be a scholar, must toil carefully through the various opinions of commentators. In this manner, and in this manner only, he can ascertain how much in the interpretation is certain, and by this means only can he have a right to an opinion of his own on disputed points. Mr. Cox has chosen to omit all matter of this kind in his commentary, and, considering the end he has in view, he has done well; but the course he has chosen, although good, is only relatively good, and his criticism of other commentators is unreasonable. Delitzsch, in his commentary of 500 closely printed pages, has not wasted a word: had he been as rhetorical or diffuse as Mr. Cox, he might well have reached 1,500 pages.

When the lexical difficulties of Job have been met, extraordinary difficulties in syntax, particularly as to the use of the tenses, remain. And even at last, when the problem of translation has been approximately solved, fresh questions at once occur to an intelligent reader. Who wrote the book? or, if we have no means of discovering its author's name, when was it written? What is the lesson which the poem is meant to teach? At first sight the moral seems to be that virtue and temporal prosperity are not necessarily connected, as cause and effect. Yet the epilogue scarcely appears to be consistent with this theory, for as a matter of fact Job's latter end is more prosperous every way than his beginning. His affliction is a mere episode in his life, for he lives after God "turns his captivity" 140 years, although he had already reached the "autumn" of his life (xxix. 4), when the "hand of God touched him." If we look more closely into the structure of the poem, we encounter new obstacles, and we come face to face with critical objections to the unity and integrity of the book. Most objection has been raised against the place occupied by the discourses of Elihu (xxxii.-xxxvii.). The three friends maintain that Job's suffering is the punishment or vengeance for his sin. Job asserts his own integrity, and even at times challenges the justice of God. Elihu takes a middle view, and suggests that Job's sufferings may be remedial or corrective. Yet this theory of Elihu does not appear, on the one hand, to be true, for, according to the prologue, Job's suffering had no connection at all with sin; nor, on the other hand, is Elihu set right or even mentioned in the epilogue, whereas the three older friends are distinctly and definitely rebuked. Add to this, that there is marked difference in style and in poetical art between these discourses of Elihu and the rest of the book, and we can understand why many scholars have concluded that they have been interpolated by a later hand. Another, and to our mind a more serious, difficulty concerns Job's words, xxvii. 11-xxviii. 28. Here Job seems to fall into the very doctrine which his three friends have urged, and against which he all along has most strenuously contended. He himself takes up the

cause of the opinion that wickedness necessarily brings temporal misfortune, having, *e.g.*, in ch. xxi. said the very contrary. It looks as if Job had been transformed for the moment into Zophar, the youngest probably, and certainly the most intemperate, of his three friends. And in fact, inasmuch as Eliphaz and Bildad speak each three times, while Zophar only speaks twice, many critics have suggested that the passage in question—viz., xxvii. 11–xxviii. 28—has fallen from its place, and is in reality the third speech of Zophar. Further, critical questions exist with regard to the descriptions of the Leviathan and the Behemoth, (xl. 15–xli. 26) but they need not detain us here.

We have given this little summary of the desiderata in a commentary on Job, hoping that it may not be without interest to a few at least of our readers. They will understand for themselves that perception of poetic beauty and dramatic art, and a heart capable of entering into the doubts and sorrows of another human heart which beat thousands of years ago, as human hearts will beat till the end of time, should not be wanting in addition to lower qualifications. Nor need we say anything of the religious spirit which should belong to a commentator on any book of Holy Scripture. We pass on to examine the way in which Mr. Cox has fulfilled the functions of a commentator, beginning with those he has fulfilled best.

As we have already said, Mr. Cox has given us a good translation. In substance it is borrowed from German and English sources; nor, as we shall presently show, is Mr. Cox capable of doing more than using the materials which modern authors have supplied. Still, the language which he makes Job speak is his own, and it has many excellences. Sometimes, indeed, Mr. Cox falls into vulgarities of style (as when he talks of "fumbling" in the dark) which are singularly untrue to the sonorous majesty of the Hebrew. Still, the translation given is clear, vivid, and tolerably harmonious, so that on the whole we have little fault to find on this score. More than this, Mr. Cox, as he informs us himself, has meditated on Job for years, read and re-read it till he has made the book his own, and the work before us fully bears out this statement. He seizes the themes of the book with great skill, and, we think, with accuracy. The higher intention of the book, according to Mr. Cox, is to show that God can inspire, and that man can give a disinterested love: that man can serve God, even when it seems to be for nought; and Job is set before us, well-nigh driven to doubt and despair, but still determined never to renounce [bless] God. The secondary intention of the poem, Mr. Cox thinks, is to show that when God smites the just, He smites in love; that His chastisement is corrective; that evil is redressed in this life if God wills, but anyhow in that life which discloses itself to the eyes of Job, just when he sinks, nay, because he sinks, to the lowest depths of sorrow. This is admirably put in the introduction; and when Mr. Cox comes to exposition he often illustrates meaning very happily. What, for example, can be more telling than this remark on iii. 5, when Job, cursing the day of his birth, exclaims, "Let darkness and the shadow of death redeem it?" "Darkness and black death," Mr. Cox writes, are the nearest of kin to that most dark and miserable day. Let

them reclaim it then, as, according to Arab and Hebrew law, kinsmen might redeem the inheritance which had fallen into the hands of a stranger. It was a portion of the kingdom of death, which had gone astray into the light; let it be recovered, recaptured, and compelled to submit once more to the sway of 'chaos and old night.'" This is a fine passage, and, unlike some fine passages in commentaries, it throws a flood of light on the meaning of the text. It is a pity that a writer who can excite interest by such honest work, should stoop to catch the interest of those who are not worth interesting, by violating good sense and good taste. What, for example, can Mr. Cox mean by saying that St. Peter describes the devil as "the peripatetic?" St. Peter simply tells us that the devil "walks about (*περιπατει*) like a roaring lion." The lowest class of Mr. Cox's readers might have spared such a feeble and senseless joke, besides a deal of irrelevant matter which he has scattered with a liberal hand over his pages.

Again, Mr. Cox is often singularly successful in seizing the subtle connexion of the argument, veiled, as it is, in the language of emotion and under Oriental imagery. This enables him to do good service on the critical questions. Nothing could be better than his vindication of Elihu's speeches, or of the passage in Job's monologue (xxvii. 11-xxviii. 28), as integral parts of the poem. We do not always like Mr. Cox's sneers at the "higher criticism," and as he has really strong arguments against those critics, he should have taken care not to use such as are evidently worthless. It may be very true that some extreme critics, quoted at second-hand by Mr. Cox, have written absurdly about Virgil. But we are at a loss to see how a perusal of these absurdities can prove a "tonic" for persons perplexed by the negative criticism on Scripture, unless the fact that orthodox writers on Job—such, *e.g.*, as the one quoted by Mr. Cox, p. 406—have said absurd things about Elihu, is a sound argument for refusing to listen to any other orthodox expositor.

We have now mentioned all the good points in Mr. Cox which we can discover. He betrays throughout not so much defect in scholarship as the absolute lack of it. He reads English and (we suppose) German; he is possessed of good natural abilities; but of Hebrew he knows nothing. His references are second-hand; and he never touches Hebrew, never for one moment deserts his German and English guides about the meaning of the Hebrew, without falling into some gross blunder. At the very outset, i. 11, "Surely he will renounce thee to thy face" (lit. if he will not! the common Hebrew form of swearing), Mr. Cox first of all misunderstands the expression, though it is explained in any elementary grammar (see Gesen. § 155, 2), and then quotes an irrelevant passage in the *Coran*, though the formula discussed occurs times innumerable in the Hebrew Bible. In v. 11 we have, "lifting up those that are cast down," when it should be "those that mourn (lit. are in black) are exalted to prosperity." These are easy passages; but xxx. 18 is very obscure. Job uses a verb which signifies to "allow oneself to be searched for," to "disguise oneself," and so to change one's appearance" (never to be changed into anything). The verse may mean, "By strength [of God]

my garment (that is, my skin) is changed; it girdeth me like the collar of a tunic"—i.e., the incrustation of his disease covers him like a close-fitting garment; or, which is much more likely, Job may mean that his garment changes its form. It hangs round him, no longer in ample folds, but falls close to his emaciated body. But when Mr. Cox ventures on an independent translation—viz., "by its great force it (the incrustation of my leprosy) is changed into a garment"—he ignores first the meaning of the verb, and then a law of Hebrew syntax. In Ps. cvi. 20 we find a word which really does mean change in the sense Mr. Cox intends, and we also see the construction which it requires. We need not give many additional samples of Mr. Cox's scholarship; one or two will suffice. Two of Job's daughters, we read at the close of the book, were called Jemima and Keren-happuch. The former name, Mr. Cox suggests, may mean "according to its Greek derivation," "day." There is, of course, no Greek word like Jemima which means "day," though there is a similar Hebrew word which means, not "day," but "days." And if, as Mr. Cox believes, Job lived in the patriarchal age, he is not very likely to have given his daughter a Greek name. However, not content with suggesting that Job may have been fond of Greek names, Mr. Cox proceeds to give a Latin derivation for the name of another daughter. Keren-happuch, he says, may be the "Hebrew form of the Greek cornucopia" (*sic*). We suppose Greek is a clerical error for Latin; but what is to be said of the derivation? True, the Septuagint does translate "*κέρας Ἀμαλθείας*," but the only possible meaning is that given by the Vulgate—viz., "*cornu stibii*."

The book we have been reviewing would be improved if some scholar of average attainments would revise it and remove these blots. They scandalize us a little in a writer who talks with such lofty disdain of the "unlearned," and make us rather curious to see the translation of Job which Mr. Cox "struck out in white heat," before he had read any of the commentators. But, when all abatements have been made, Mr. Cox's work is in many respects instructive, and even delightful. We cannot learn from him, as we can from Dr. Wright or from Mr. Cheyne; still, we have much to thank him for, and he may hope for a larger audience than they can reach.

W. E. ADDIS.

The Life of Mother Frances Mary Teresa Ball. By HENRY JAMES COLERIDGE, S.J. (Quarterly Series.) London: Burns and Oates. 1881.

A LIFE of Mrs. Ball, following so quickly her Life by Dr. Hutch, has probably been a surprise to many readers. The present Life, however, by the eminent Jesuit Father who edits the "Quarterly Series," is quite an independent work. It is shorter; it is extremely accurate; it contains a very great number of the letters of the holy nun and foundress not elsewhere published; and those who know Father Coleridge's writings will be prepared to find perfect literary form, with a fine and sustained spiritual tone.

Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire de Paris, avec le Journal de ses Actes. Par M. H. WALLON, Membre de l'Institut. Vol. I. Paris and London: L. Hachette and Co.

TUA RES AGITUR is an expression which may well be used when noticing a new work on the French Revolutionary Tribunal; for we must not be told that the days of terrorism are over, and that, thanks to the Republican government now committed to the firm but moderate hands of M. Grévy, the Golden Age has at last made its appearance. When, about twenty years ago, M. Emile Campardon published his "*Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire*," optimists repeated to us *ad nauseam* exactly the same thing. According to them, the guillotine had abdicated, and the red flag was torn to shreds. Since that epoch we have had the Commune, with the citizens Délescluze, Assi, Raoul Rigault, and Cluseret; the temporary triumph of the mob has led to massacres in the prisons, exactly as when Danton was Minister of Justice: and if France, from one end to the other, did not share the fate of the capital, it was simply because the Prussians had effectually kept Paris in a complete state of isolation. As M. Wallon remarks in his preface, nothing of the kind is to be dreaded, of course, *so long as the present constitution lasts*. With two Legislative Chambers and an Executive proceeding from them, although exercising independent power, the reign of terror is impossible, although we may, and we probably shall, have to witness transient outbursts of party-spirit manifesting themselves by persecutions and annoyances of various kinds. But this form of government is precisely the obstacle which the Radicals are bent upon removing. Suppose one Legislative Assembly and an Executive naturally subordinate to it, the struggle would soon begin again, and in a week Paris would be bristling with barricades. When we see the daily appeals made by the *intransigent* papers to the passions of the mob—when we reflect, moreover, that the Government itself sedulously helps the Socialists and Communists in suppressing every spark of religious feeling, what hope can we possibly have for the future? And let us note, by-the-by, the monstrous absurdity implied in the cry *guerre au bourgeois*! Why, the *bourgeois* is nothing else but the people, knowing no privileged class above them, no disinherited below; to dispossess the *bourgeois* would be to rob him of the fruits of a labour, the rights of which the *ouvrier* cannot deny without condemning his own children to the position of a *proletaire*. Such are the dreams and utopias of modern revolutionists; a moment's folly would transform their dreams into the saddest of realities.

It is with the view of reading a lesson both to the thoughtless and the dreamer that M. Wallon has published the work we are now noticing; one volume of it is in our hands—two more, we believe, are to come. Already, last year, the same author had treated the same dismal subject. In a couple of duodecimos comprising a series of newspaper articles on histories, memoirs, correspondence, and other documents referring to the French Revolution; on the present occasion he gives an original work—a work, we mean, in which he comments from

his own point of view on the numerous official papers which ten years' assiduous research have enabled him to find "in public and private collections."

Previous to M. Wallon's "*Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire*," we had in our libraries two works bearing very nearly on the same period of French politics; the one was the late M. Maxime Ternaux' "*Histoire de la Terreur*," left, unfortunately, incomplete; the other was M. Campardon's monograph alluded to above. The former is of a general character, whereas the design of M. Wallon is merely to show how the Terrorists administered justice; the other is hardly anything but a set of *pièces justificatives*, most valuable, no doubt, but requiring a kind of running comment, which is not added; in fact, M. Campardon's idea was merely to supply materials for historians, and, so far, he has been pre-eminently successful: M. Wallon gives us both documents and illustrations; he lays the scene open, makes the actors say their say, draws his own conclusions, and invites us to draw ours.

It would, however, have been tedious to fill two large octavo volumes with the reports of all the cases judged by the Revolutionary tribunal. M. Wallon has accordingly divided his work into two parts; in the first place, we have the great political trials, together with some others which are specially interesting from the view they give of the spirit which animated the court, and the mode in which the investigations, cross-questionings and deliberations were conducted. These are, as much as possible, classed according to the nature of the offence. It was, let us add, impossible for the author to retain this classification throughout, because, as time wore on, the charges were more and more puerile, and the victims, brought to the bar of the tribunal under all kinds of pretexts, were included in one common accusation. The second part of the work forms a kind of journal or catalogue, giving merely the chronological enumeration both of the cases discussed previously in detail, and of many supplementary ones too insignificant to deserve more than a bare mention.

M. Wallon begins by describing the origin of the Revolutionary tribunal, and by showing that it arose from the events of August 10. A body which owed its creation to violence alone, was sure to conjure up against itself adversaries on every side, and, further, to exaggerate the number of these adversaries. The insurrection triumphed at the storming of the Tuileries, and, as a natural consequence, the unfortunate king was accused of having plotted against the safety of the State and kindled the torch of civil war. But such a design necessarily supposes accomplices, and hence a series of trials and juridical murders, the last of which struck down Robespierre and his party. From the 10th of August sprang the massacres of September 1792; these prepared the way for January 21, and May 31, 1793; after the Girondists, the Hébertists, and the Dantonists, there remained nothing but the purveyors of the guillotine standing; they managed to quarrel among themselves, and in their downfall they carried along with them the court of assassins which had so unrelentingly done their work.

Charlotte Corday, Marie Antoinette, and the Girondists form the three leading episodes in M. Wallon's first volume; we say leading episodes, because a number of secondary incidents are narrated, such as the defection of Dumouriez, the trial and execution of Custine, the circumstances connected with the *loi des suspects*, the Rouen manifestations, &c., &c. The journal or summary which completes the volume begins with the sitting of August 17, 1792, and ends with that of September 21, 1793. Our author has thus laid before the reading community a faithful and interesting history of the Revolutionary tribunal, both in its organization and its working, and the merits of this chronicle of wickedness make us look earnestly forward to the publication of the concluding volumes.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

Les Officialités au Moyen Age. Etude sur l'Organisation, la Compétence, la Procédure des Tribunaux Ecclésiastiques ordinaires de France, de 1180 à 1328. Par PAUL FOURNIER. Paris: E. Plon. 1880.

THE book with which M. Fournier has recently presented us, deserves to be regarded as a model of erudition, of clearness, and of common sense; it interests not only those who study canon law, but all persons anxious to know something about the relation between the Church and the State during the Middle Ages. The researches which such a work as this presupposes, are immense; facts, proper names, dates, quotations occur repeatedly, and therefore an alphabetical index would have been an invaluable assistance to the reader; let us hope that M. Fournier will add it when a second edition is sent to press.

We must not expect to find here what the author did not intend to give—namely, a complete history of ecclesiastical procedure; the scope of his work merely implied an account of the Church dignitaries called “officials,” who were instituted about the twelfth century for the purpose of assisting the bishops in the discharge of their duties. It is evident, however, that the whole nature of the ecclesiastical law courts, the position and powers of the diocesans, and the corresponding rights of the laity, are essentially bound up with the subject, and give to the volume we are now reviewing a far higher importance than that of a mere monograph.

Amongst the plans of reform entertained by the Council of Trent was one concerning the organization and administration of the episcopal sees: how thoroughly required such a reform was, appears from M. Fournier's preface, which is the most complete refutation possible of the stupid ranting some persons are fond of indulging in, on the tyranny and absolute power of mediæval prelates. In the first place, the archdeacons could not be removed at pleasure by the bishop, and enjoyed, as a matter of course, almost absolute independence. In the next, most of the cathedral chapters, having obtained exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, were, so far as internal organization was concerned, under the direct authority of the Holy See; at the same time they had a necessary share in the legislative power of the diocese, so that the bishop, whilst unable to touch their privileges, or even to

exercise his rights as visitor, was compelled, in a great number of cases, to consult them and take their advice; hence a constant state of animosity and of bickerings, rights usurped, privileges contested, the most objectionable features of feudalism introduced into the government of the Church.

The appointment of the dignitaries to which the name "official" has been given, is due to the deplorable state of things we have just been attempting to describe; it is also the result of the evergrowing study of Roman law. It we read, says M. Fournier, the sentences passed by a Church court during the first half of the twelfth century, we easily perceive that there is no regular mode or form of procedure, the terminology has no precision, and the judge does not feel shut up, so to say, within a narrow circle of necessary forms. On the other hand, at the close of that century, and towards the beginning of the thirteenth, especially, the decrees of ecclesiastical courts mention in a strictly invariable order the forms prescribed by the code of Justinian, which has returned to life again; and several of these forms are required under penalty of nullity. Obligated to conduct his cases through all the intricacies of a learned procedure, subtle, complicated, full of difficulties, the bishop, who was not necessarily a lawyer, often gave way under the pressure. Would not his natural course, therefore, be to delegate the management of contentious jurisdiction to a clerk skilled in the study of canon law? This would be absolutely indispensable when the rules of Justinian's code were rendered obligatory, as these rules extended the administrative power of the Church.

In connection with the functions of the ecclesiastical courts, and of the officials, a number of questions suggest themselves, which it would be most interesting to discuss, if time allowed us to do so: let us, however, mention one fact, perfectly patent to those who study the history of the Middle Ages impartially and fairly—the populations in general, far from believing the authority of the ecclesiastical courts oppressive and arbitrary, regarded it as much more lenient and much milder than that of the lay barons. Their efforts, consequently, tended uniformly to increase it, because it was the result of customs which expressed the real wants of society. There were abuses, no doubt, and M. Fournier is too unprejudiced not to point them out; but they sprang more from the rivalry of personal interests than from questions of principle; moreover, they manifested themselves by feuds between the prelates and the barons, rather than between the Pope and the king. It is a curious fact, that during the whole of his reign St. Louis had to struggle against a kind of anti-clerical movement which prevailed amongst the feudal lords and the legists. Whenever he treated with the Court of Rome through the medium of his law advisers, he met with difficulties which these very gentlemen raised for their own private purposes: if he carried on his negotiations directly, he always found reconciliation easy, and *entente cordiale* a matter of course. The chapter which M. Fournier has devoted to the discussions between the civil power and the Papacy, from the reign of Philip Augustus to that of Philip the Fair, is certainly one of the most interesting in the

volume, and we recommend it to the serious attention of our readers.

The benefits rendered by the Church to mediæval society have often, as we all know, been denied by so-called philosophers trained at the school of Voltaire and of the *Encyclopédistes*. After having carefully studied M. Fournier's learned monograph, an unprejudiced person must needs come to the conclusion that, representing as it did both the traditions of Christianity and those of Roman civilization, it offered to society at large guarantees of order, of peace, and of security, which feudalism did not, and could not, possess. If it exceeded sometimes the rights it enjoyed, such abuses were immediately corrected, and the encroachments of certain members of the clergy always found themselves checked and censured by the prompt action of their superiors.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. New Edition. In three volumes. London: Longmans.

IT is not our intention to review in detail these three volumes, a cheap reprint, with a supplementary chapter, of the well-known work published by Mr. Froude seven years ago. It is enough to say that, like everything which proceeds from his pen, this book is fascinating in the brilliancy of its execution, and repulsive in the unconscionable partisanship of its statements. History is the last department of literary activity into which Mr. Froude should have ventured. It may be said of him as Lord Macaulay said of Mr. Gladstone, and with even greater truth, that whatever he sees is refracted and distorted by a false medium of passions and prejudices. He is absolutely wanting in the judicial mind, which is the first requisite of the historian. He is an advocate, and a not very scrupulous advocate. There are, however, let us add, some retrenchments and qualifications in this edition, which show that Mr. Froude is not wholly insensible to the exposure which was made of the misrepresentations of fact contained in his work as it originally appeared. It will be remembered, for example, how severely he was taken to task by Mr. Lecky for his assertion that the abductions which so frequently disgraced Ireland were sanctioned by the Catholic clergy. "The priests"—for it is well to quote Mr. Froude's own words—"the priests, secure in the protection of the people, laughed at penalties which existed only on paper, and encouraged practices which brought converts to the faith, and put money in their own pockets. Mr. Lecky, in a few masterly pages of his "*History of England in the Eighteenth Century*," showed not only that "not one particle of evidence could be adduced for this accusation," but that there was ample evidence before Mr. Froude's eyes, in the documents cited by that writer, to show what stringent measures were taken by ecclesiastical authority to suppress the crime in question. We are glad to see that Mr. Froude has accepted the correction (although without acknowledgment), and that this particular calumny has disappeared from his work. It is a sign of grace, upon which we beg leave to offer him our congratulations.

A Year's Meditations. By MRS. AUGUSTUS CRAVEN. Translated from the French. London: C. Kegan Paul. 1881.

THE following extract from the preface will best explain the nature of this beautiful little book:—

These pages were written solely and exclusively for myself; not during a time specially devoted to religious meditation, but when, on the contrary, leading an unsettled and somewhat worldly sort of life, I feared that I might lose the power of concentrating my thoughts on subjects which, whatever may be our occupations and callings in this world, are in fact the only subjects of real interest and importance to us all.

Finding, therefore, that, to use an almost obsolete but expressive word, my mind was not sufficiently recollected for what is properly termed a "meditation," I took to setting down, each day, the thoughts and aspirations suggested to me by the portion of the Gospel which I had been reading in the morning.

I think it due to my readers to mention this fact, because it imparts to these reflections the only value they can possess—that value, namely, which often attaches to a fortuitous remark, or to a thought casually expressed in our presence, but not personally addressed to ourselves. It may be others besides myself have found that similar stray shots often reach further and sink deeper into the mind than can the soundest advice directed to oneself, even when clothed in words of the keenest eloquence.

Something of the kind has happened with regard to these meditations. They fell accidentally under the eyes of strangers, and attracted their attention from the very fact of their not being written with any purpose of instruction or advice to others.

A too-indulgent friend conceived the idea that the favourable impression produced by these pages upon the very few who had read them might be extended to others, and with that view has thought them worthy of an English translation.

May she not have been too blindly partial! and may indeed, my poor meditations serve, according to her anticipations, to induce others to ponder on the heavenly Catholic truths to which they relate!

We cordially echo Mrs. Craven's aspirations. We are quite sure that no religiously minded person who takes up her little volume can fail to derive from it much pleasure and profit.

Dr. Appleton: his Life and Literary Relics. By J. H. APPLETON, M.A., and A. H. SAYCE, M.A. London: Trübner and Co. 1881.

DR. APPLETON'S claims to distinction are twofold. He was the founder and first editor of the *Academy*, and he was the inventor of the phrase "endowment of research." Both the newspaper and the phrase live after him, and are likely to live. Both have been fruitful, and are likely to bring forth more fruit. The *Academy* represents a distinct type of review, its main aim being that authoritative writers should report in it on publications relating to subjects in their own province. And gradually the idea of which he was the apostle, that Universities should be something more than big schools—that it is part, and the chief part, of their office to foster "mature study," and "to add to the already acquired accumulation of knowledge"—has been making its way into the public mind. He died at thirty-seven, of disease of the lungs brought on by overwork. The

modest "literary remains" in this volume are but a small remnant of what he did. The most interesting of them is his "Plea for Metaphysic," a reply, and a not ineffective reply, to Mr. Matthew Arnold's attack upon the study of Philosophy. The Memoir is written with good sense and natural feeling, and is conspicuous for the absence of any attempt to exalt its subject by undue eulogy.

The Variorum Teacher's Bible. With various Renderings and Readings from the best Authorities. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1880.

THIS is certainly one of the most important publications of our age of Biblical revision and commentary. It anticipates the work of the Westminster Revisers, which will not be ready for publication till May; and at the same time it enables the public to see how vast is the labour of revision by putting them in possession of the material on which revisers have to work. In fact, it almost helps a reader to revise the authorized version for himself. When the Westminster Revision has fixed its text, many will read the improved version without noticing the changes introduced, being quite unconscious of the opposing critical forces of which that rendering is the resultant. But with the Variorum Bible, and its formidable array on every page of various readings and renderings, backed up with whole alphabets of initials, this is impossible.

The fear is, lest perhaps the mind of the ordinary Bible-reading public is hardly prepared for such a revelation of variation and divergence in a version authorized by the good king James. Bishop Ellicott, we believe, said that a revision of the English Bible would rob Dissenters of their best texts. The tendency of the Variorum Bible is to drown all alike in a flood of uncertainty and variation. In fact, a Variorum Bible, unsettling reading and rendering alike, is the *reductio ad absurdum* of the soli-biblical principle of Protestantism. How happy would the author of the "Errata" have been, could he have foreseen the day when the Queen's printers would issue a Variorum Bible, and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge a Revision of King James's.

Still, it must be acknowledged that this work is a wonderful epitome of the toils of biblical critics, and a marvel of condensed knowledge. Whatever the effect upon the unlearned, it is a book very useful to the student, especially if he can be sure of its accuracy. On this point one cannot but express doubts. For, on referring to the well-known passage, 1 Cor. xi. 27, the various reading is made to support the error of the text by citing MSS. and editions which are unquestionably of the opposite reading. Again, the distinction between a various reading and a various rendering is not always capable of expression in English, and is often very confusing. The care taken by the Editors, when citing the Sinaitic and Vatican codices, to distinguish between the work of the different correctors, is needlessly minute. In looking at certain difficult passages in the Old Testament, it is disappointing to

find that the various renderings given seldom diminish the difficulty, even where that is quite possible; for instance, the old difficulties about the number of Ephraimites slain (Judges xii. 6), or the mén of Beth-shemesh (1 Kings vi. 19). Nor is anything done to relieve Dr. Colenso of his difficulty as to how the priest could carry the whole bullock some three-quarters of a mile (Lev. iv. 12).

Catherine d'Aragon et les origines du Schisme Anglican.

Par ALBERT DU BOYS. Paris: Victor Palmé. 1880.

IN the above work M. du Boys has furnished the French public with an ably-written, conscientious, and therefore trustworthy, Life of the first of Henry VIII.'s unhappy wives. As one of Catherine's admirers long since said—

Those that can pity, here
May, if they think it well, let fall a tear;
The subject will deserve it. Such as give
Their money out of hope, they may believe,
May here find truth too. (Prologue to "King Henry VIII.")

In these two requisites for an interesting volume, a worthy subject and historical truth, M. du Boys is eminently happy. Few lives have more sad interest attaching to them than has Catherine of Aragon's, and few have been more completely cleared from the misrepresentations of a more prejudiced age by the recent discoveries and publication of the genuine records of the period when that life was not yet a thing of the past.

To English readers there may not be anything very new or very striking in this work, but even to them it ought to be a subject of congratulation that sound views on historical subjects are being propagated abroad, and the excellent summary which M. du Boys gives of the beginning of the English schism may be of use even here in England. The history of that schism is necessarily connected with the tale of Queen Catherine's wrongs, and so much of it as M. du Boys has told makes us look forward with pleasure to his promised biographies of Cardinals Fisher and Pole, where we may hope to see the subject continued. Its completion must yet be told in the Life of yet another Cardinal, the great Dr. Allen, whose memory is surely deserving of some lasting monument in English Catholic literature.

BOOKS OF DEVOTION AND SPIRITUAL READING.

1. *Meditations for every day in the Year.* By the Right Rev. Dr. CHALLENGOR. A New and Revised Edition by the Very Rev. Monsignor VIRTUE. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.
2. *Manual for Communion;* containing Meditations and Prayers in the form of a Retreat before First Communion. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.
3. *St. Mary Magdalen.* By Père LACORDAIRE. Translated by E. A. HAZELAND. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.
4. *Catechism of First Communion.* Suitable for Children. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.
5. *The Practice of Interior Recollection with God.* Drawn from the Psalms of David. By Father PAUL SEGNERI, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.
6. *The Lamb of God;* or, Reflections on the Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the Rev. T. H. KINANE, P.P. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.
7. *The Parochial Hymn-Book.* New and Revised Edition. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.
8. *The Dominican Hymn-Book,* with Vespers and Compline. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.
9. *The Priest of the Eucharist;* or, a Sketch of the Life of Very Rev. Peter J. Eymard. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.
10. *The Story of St. Frideswide, Virgin and Patroness of Oxford.* By FRANCIS GOLDIE, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.
11. *Select Works of the Venerable Father Nicholas Lancicius, S.J.* Translated from the Latin. Vol. II. With a Preface by Father GALLWEY, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.

1. Monsignor Virtue has given us a new and revised issue of the meditations of Bishop Challoner. (There seems really no reason why the familiar name should be spelt "Challenor" in the new edition.) This admirable book of spiritual reading will probably retain its hold over the affections of devout Catholics for many years yet to come. The Editor professes to have eliminated certain grotesque peculiarities of style, to have corrected undoubted mistakes, and to have pruned away a "large amount" of redundant words. The last operation is one that might easily be carried too far. Bishop Challoner's "lists" of words are generally full of design. To the attentive reader they supply a number of distinct points of thought and meditation, arranged in natural sequence and not one of them really redundant. Challoner may easily be over-edited, if one starts with the idea that he is to be adapted exclusively to be read aloud. The amiable Dr. Husenbeth edited him (disastrously) some forty years ago, on the principle of fitting him "to be read aloud in families and communities." We are glad to see that Monsignor Virtue has restored the greater part of what Dr. Husenbeth left out. Perhaps, however, the eighteen additional meditations which Dr. Husenbeth added from the works of

Alban Butler, might have been inserted with advantage. The present edition will be welcome to those who wish for a handsome copy, at a reasonable price, of the solid, fruitful, and most penetrating "Considerations" of a man whose name can never be forgotten by English Catholics.

2. This "Manual," which reaches us from Dublin, is, on the whole, a pious, sensible, and useful preparation for first Communion, and for Communion in general. The devout reflections or meditations on our Blessed Lord, and on the Holy Eucharist itself, strike us as being very effective. It does not seem that the writer succeeds so well on the subject of Sin. We have here the customary feudal view of a man's duties and shortcomings. The preacher must go deeper than this, or else the present generation will not be persuaded that sin is a very great evil. Some of the prayers are far too long, especially for children. We may remark that the magnificent prayer of St. Thomas of Aquin, after Communion, is disfigured by a slight omission; and that there are two "Litanies" which have no business to be in the book.

3. We need do nothing more than announce this pretty little volume, containing a well executed translation of Lacordaire's picturesque and vigorous Life of St. Mary Magdalen.

4. A Catechism specially prepared for the instruction of first Communicants, is useful both to the candidates and to their teachers. The one named here will be found suitable in every respect. Its price is only one penny, and it contains 70 pages of matter.

5. Few preachers or devout writers have understood and used Holy Scripture better than Father Segneri. His profound acquaintance with them reminds us of St. Augustine himself, whilst his happy touch in rendering them luminous by a slight word of exegesis brings back St. Thomas of Aquin. The little book called "The Practice of Interior Recollection with God, drawn from the Psalms of David," was originally compiled from the Latin text of the Psalter, with brief annotations in Italian. Both text and notes have here been rendered into English, and the result is a pleasing volume of Scriptural prayer for all occasions and all sorts of people.

6. Archdeacon Kinane is already known to readers in Ireland and England by his devout book called the "Dove of the Tabernacle," and other pious treatises. The work under notice is similar in style and treatment to those already published; but the subject is even more attractive. It was a very happy idea to present the whole life of our Lord in the form of a devout half-expository, half-meditative history. On the whole, nothing so well suits the generality of Christians for meditation as the life of our Blessed Saviour. To set forth this divine life quite simply, but with many pious thoughts and a commentary of ardent aspiration, has been Dr. Kinane's purpose. The book, which is strongly recommended in a preface by the Archbishop of Cashel, will be welcomed by many.

7 and 8. These two Hymnals will be found useful, each in its sphere. The Parochial Hymn-book, of which this is a new

and revised edition, has only one defect that we can see, and that is, the smallness of the type; and we confess that it is not easy to see how that could be helped. As it is, the book contains an immense amount of matter, having devotions for all occasions and requirements, as well as the 400 or 500 hymns from which it takes its name. The "Dominican Hymn-book" wears, as might be expected, a Dominican complexion, and groups its hymns round the Dominican Offices and Liturgy. The two books naturally, to some extent, print the same hymns. There are one or two curious divergences in the texts; for instance, the well-known hymn "O happy flowers, O happy flowers!" begins, in the Dominican collection, "O flowers, O happy flowers, which day and night!" and carries the same unlike likeness throughout the version. There is one phrase of a popular hymn in which we cannot help wishing that one or other had deviated into correctness and sense: what does "*thrown* on life's surge" mean? Surely the obvious word is "tost."

9. Père Eymard, of whose life Lady Herbert here gives a most readable and devout sketch, was at first a member of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, but left that congregation to found the "Congregation of the Most Holy Sacrament" (1858). This little book may well attract the attention of all pastors who are anxious to promote in their flocks the first of all devotions—devotion to the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. It would be an excellent text-book for the "confraternities" or "altar societies" which are happily multiplying amongst us.

10. The holy Virgin Frideswide, the patroness of Oxford, lived a long time ago; but there seems little reason, as Father Goldie well remarks, to doubt that her legend is substantially historical. It could hardly be better set forth, in its picturesqueness and its touching associations, than in this beautifully got-up volume. If the saints guard and bless the places where their names rest, as we know they do, then will the Catholic revival in Oxford be well promoted by this opportune act of devotion to a patroness who can do more for Oxford than all her doctors.

11. This is a well-executed translation, carefully edited, of two most useful treatises of Lancelotti, one on "Rash Judgment," the other on "Aridity." It need not be said that Lancelotti is a solid and fertile writer, one of those great Jesuit compilers who brought the treasures of the ancient spirituality to the door of Christians who were beginning to live as if there were no other food for the soul but pedantic sermons and fierce polemics. His works are truly treasure-houses of thoughts and examples. May we mildly protest against Father Gallwey's misreading, or bad recollection, of Venerable Bede? The famous council at Godmundham was not called to deliberate whether St. Paulinus should be obeyed or killed. King Edwin had made up his mind to be baptized, and the assembly was held in order, if possible, that all his chiefs might consent to be baptized with him. The "Let him die!" is the effect of the pure light of nature (Pref. v.).

INDEX.

- ABBOT, Dr. Ezra, the Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, *noticed*, 241.
- Addis, Rev. W. E., on Bunsen's Angel-Messiah, 448; on Cox's Book of Job, 495.
- Africa, Central, Catholic Missions in, 394; *see* Missions.
- Alzog's Manual of Church History, *noticed*, 213.
- Anglo-Saxon Women, 293.
- Antiquities; use of the term, 251.
- Appleton, J. H., and Sayce, A. H., Life of Dr. Appleton, *noticed*, 505.
- Arun and Adur rivers, 253, *seq.*
- Australia, Western, the Benedictines in, 56; growth of civilization and religion in, 58; first landing of monks in, 60; savages of, 61; butchery of savages in, 62; Missionaries set out for bush, 62; hardships suffered by early Missionaries in, 64; New Nursia founded, 67; success with aborigines of, 68; schools for native children of, 69; prospects of the colony in, 74.
- BAUNARD, L'Abbé, Le Vicomte de Melun, *noticed*, 246.
- Bastian, Dr. H. Charlton, on Brain and Mind, 25; a representative idealistic-materialist, *ib.*; analysis of his book, 27; his origin of nervous system, *ib.*; structure of nervous tissue, 28; objectionable use of word "mind," 29; objects to unconscious sensation, 30, 36; on reflex action, 33; misuse of "discrimination," 34; on sensation, ideation, and perception, 35; on consciousness in animals, 40; on instinct, 42; on mental powers of brutes, 45; on development, &c., of human brain, 46; on origin of language, 46, 49; on origin of "moral sense," 48; various errors in his book, 51.
- Bellesheim, Dr., on Heinrich's Theologie, 489; on Hergenröther's Kirchengeschichte, 492.
- Benedictine Mission in Western Australia, 56.
- Benedictine nuns revive Latin drama, 293.
- Bognor, Roman villa at, 258.
- Boys, Albert du, Catherine D'Aragon, *noticed*, 507.
- Brain, the, and the Mind, 25.
- Bunsen, Ernest De, Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes, and Christians, *noticed*, 488.

- CAMPS, Ancient, in Western Sussex, 254.
 Catechism of First Communion, *noticed*, 508.
 Challoner's Meditations, by Mgr. Virtue, *noticed*, 508.
 "Church," meaning of "I believe in the Catholic," 357.
 Cissbury Camp, 254.
 Clare, Sister M. F., Life of the Blessed Virgin, *noticed*, 241.
 Clifton, the Bishop of, on Days of the Week and Works of Creation, 311.
 Coleridge, H. J., S. J., Life of Mother F. M. T. Ball, *noticed*, 499.
 Colonization, Irish Catholic; *see* United States.
 Comparative Scientific Methods, 271.
 Conscience, Dr. Charlton Bastian on, 48.
 "Corpus Missal," and its probable date, 333; edited by Mr. Warren, 334; mistakes of editor of, *ib.*; palæographic evidence for date of, 337; liturgical evidence, 338; historical evidence, *ib.*; Reviewer's opinion of date of, 346.
 Cox, Samuel, Commentary on the Book of Job, *noticed*, 495.
 Cozza-Luzi, J., Historia Sancti Patris Benedicti, *noticed*, 237.
 Craven, Mrs. A., A Year's Meditation, *noticed*, 505.
 Creation, Works of, and Days of Week, 311.
 Cussack, M. F., The Case of Ireland Stated, *noticed*, 229.
 Cyril and Methodius, SS., apostles of Slavs and Russians, 422.
- DANTIER, Alphonse, Les Femmes dans la Société Chrétienne, 288.
 Darmsteter's Translation of the Zend-Avesta, *noticed*, 472.
 Days of the Week, and the Works of Creation, on 311; consecrated by Moses to the Creator, 318; objection to this theory of, 319; mentioned in no other Cosmogony, 324; Day-of-Sun, special place among, 325; Day of Rest, what? 327.
 Delitzsch, Professor G., Messianic Prophecies, *noticed*, 238.
 Dering, E. H., Freville Chase, *noticed*, 223.
 Devotion and Spiritual Reading, Books of, *noticed*, 508.
 Discrimination, Intellectual, Sensuous, and Vegetal, 36.
 Dominican Hymn-Book, *noticed*, 508.
 Dowson, J., Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology, &c., *noticed*, 483.
 Duffy, Sir Charles Gavan, Young Ireland, *noticed*, 226.
 Dunton, Discovery of Hypocaust at, 266.
- EGYPTOLOGY and Mosaic Account of Creation, 315.
 Eliot, George, the genius of, 371; resemblance of to Savonarola, 372; creative powers of, 373; high excellences of her "Romola," 376; Charlotte Brontë, compared with, 379; is the Pythoness of modern science, 380; her works form an Epic, 383; her fine painting of country life, 384; her humour, 389; her humour and Dickens's contrasted, 391; her works affected by her religion, 393.
 "Endymion," the, not equal to author's former works, 146; outline of story of, 150; moral purpose of, 151; purpose defeated by plot, 156, 158; public interest in 159; on Papal aggression, 162; style of, 163.

Eternal Hope, Canon Farrar's, 118.

Everlasting Punishment, 117; true character of present controversy about, *ib.*; articles of Catholic Faith concerning, 120; Scriptural proofs for, 123; ethical reasons against, 127; proof from "reason" for, 127; what kind of sin merits, 132; what are "pains" of, 135; alleged delight of the Blessed in, 137; question of "duration" and, 138; goodness of God and, 140; possibility of death-bed repentance, 143.

F's, the Three, 189.

Farrar's, Canon, "Eternal Hope," 118.

Fournier, Paul, *Les Officialités au Moyen Age*, *noticed*, 502.

Froude, J. A., *The English in Ireland*, *noticed*, 504.

GENESIS, First Chapter of, Character of, 319; a Sacred Hymn, 321.

Gladstone's, Mr., reply to Abbé Martin, 369.

Goldie, Francis, S.J., *Story of St. Frideswide*, *noticed*, 508.

Goulburn's, Dean, work on Everlasting Punishment, 119.

Graves, A. Percival, *Irish Songs and Ballads*, *noticed*, 233.

HARLEZ, Professor Charles de, on Darmesteter's *Zend-Avesta*, 472.

Heinrich, Dr. J. B., *Dogmatische Theologie*, *noticed*, 489.

Hell, Gehenna and Hades, 126; *see* Everlasting Punishment.

Hergenröther, Cardinal, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte*, *noticed*, 492.

INSTINCT, Dr. Charlton Bastian on, 42.

Intellectu, Nihil in, *quin prius in sensu*, explained, 40.

"Ireland, Justice to," 165; present wretchedness in, 166, 169, 183; outrages and Land Question in, 168; very small holdings, an evil in, 171; old relations between landlord and tenants, 173; Encumbered Estates Act, 176; Compensation for Improvements Bills, 177; recent mistaken legislation for, 179; Tenant-right provisions in act of '70, 181; present work of Land League, 185; Three F's considered, 189; Is coercion called for? 193.

Irish, Catholic Colonization Association of United States, 103; Land Question, 166, *seq.*

JENKINS, Rev. L. O., *Student's Handbook of British and American Literature*, *noticed*, 245.

Juan, Don, of Austria, 1; early life of, 2; his gifts of nature and fortune, 3; and Don Carlos's rebellion, 4; sent Commander to Granada, 5; vain and inconsistent character of, 7; and the Holy League, 8; desired by Greeks for king, 10; contemplates Christian monarchy at Tunis, 11; aims at Vicariate-General of Italy, 12; an honourable politician, 13; and Mary,

Queen of Scots, 13 ; sent to Low Countries, 14 ; Philip's suspicions of, 15, 18 ; conduct of, in adversity, 21 ; his holy end, 23.
 Jukes, Mr., Second Death and Restitution of all Things, 119.

KHARTOUM, Mgr. Comboni's Head Mission Station, 409.

Kinane, Very Rev. T. H., The Lamb of God, *noticed*, 508.

LACORDAIRE, Père, St. Mary Magdalen, *noticed*, 508.

Lamy, Professor T. J., on Russian Church, its history and present organization, 422.

Lancicius, Ven. N., S. J., Select Works, vol. ii., *noticed*, 508.

Land Question in Ireland ; *see* Ireland, Justice to.

Language, Dr. Charlton Bastian, on Origin of, 46.

Lee, Dr. F. G., The Church under Queen Elizabeth, referred to, 96, 350 ; *noticed*, 218.

Leigh, Aston, The Story of Philosophy, *noticed*, 244.

Leo XIII. on St. Thomas of Aquin, 196 ; on SS. Cyril and Methodius, 422 ; on Society for Propagation of the Faith, 451 ; Letter of, to Cardinal Guibert, 455.

Lepanto, Spanish policy at, 9.

Livingstone, Dr., tribute to, 399.

MANUAL for Communion, *noticed*, 508.

Martin, L'Abbé, "Anglican Ritualism" referred to, 96, 350 ; *noticed*, 216.

Mary Queen of Scots, scheme for marriage of, to Don Juan, 13 ; scheme revealed to Elizabeth, 19.

Masson, Gustave, on Wallon's Tribunal Revolutionnaire de Paris, 500 ; on Fournier's Officialités au Moyen Age, 502.

Methodius and Cyril, Apostles of Slavs, 422.

Methods of Historical Inquiry, 269 ; comparative method, 270 ; erroneous methods, 275 ; influence of imagination on, 280 ; of prejudice, 281 ; of diverse mental complexions, 282 ; of language, 285.

Mind, Dr. Charlton Bastian on scope of, 28 ; his use of the word, 29.

Missions, Catholic, in Central Africa, 394 ; ancient and modern contrasted, 396 ; special dangers to modern, 398 ; long-established on Coast, 400 ; three chief lines of, *ib.* ; moral obstacles to, 401 ; material obstacles to, 402 ; discovered traces of ancient, 404 ; Mgr. Comboni's described, 406 ; extended to El Obeid, 411 ; troubles at El Obeid, 415 ; extended to Gadaref, 419 ; success of, placed in rising generation, 421.

Moral Sense, Dr. Charlton Bastian on origin of, 48.

Morris, Father W. B., the Apostle of Ireland, *noticed*, 230.

Moses, Learning of, 316 ; special work as lawgiver, *ib.*

Muir, J., Metrical Translations from Sanskrit Writers, *noticed*, 484.

NERVOUS System, origin of, 27.

Newman, Cardinal, Lectures on Difficulties felt by Anglicans, analysed, 76.

Nursia, New, Benedictine Mission in, 56; *see* Australia, Western.

OBERHOFFER, H., Organ School for Catholic Organists, *noticed*, 222.

Ollé-Laprune, Leon, De la Certitude Morale, *noticed*, 250.

Oxenham, H. N., Catholic Eschatology, 119.

Ozanam, C. A., Vie de Frédéric Ozanam, *noticed*, 246.

PAROCHIAL Hymn-Book, *noticed*, 508.

"Period" Theory of Creation, difficulties of, 312.

Periodicals *noticed*: French, 204, 466; Italian, 201, 462; German, 199, 459.

Pesch, T., S.J., Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis, *noticed*, 234.

Peter the Great and the Russian Church, 433; his Canon, 435.

Philip II., character of, 1; conduct to Don Juan of Austria, 2, 5, 15, 18, 23; objects of, in Holy League, 8.

Port Victoria, suppression of, 71.

Priest of the Eucharist, *noticed*, 508.

Pusey, Dr., on Eternal Punishment, 119.

RASCOLNICKS, Russian Schismatics, 431.

Ritualism estimated from Within and Without, 350; from without, 352; from within, 354; Dr. Lee's book useful, 359; Abbé Martin over-estimates, 360; its practice of obedience, 363; possible future, 366.

Roads, Roman, in Sussex, 256.

Roman Antiquities in Sussex, 256, 258; Villas, remarks on, 261; became models to Anglo-Saxons, 263; remains at Duneaton and Avisford, 266.

Russian Church; History and Present Organization, 422; first chief See at Kiév, 427; becomes schismatic, 428; subjected to Tzars, 429; Holy Synod of, 433; present state of, 440; list of bishoprics in, 443; White Clergy of, 445; Black Clergy of, 447; bondage of, to Tzars, 448.

Russians, Origin of Christianity among, 422; follow Greek Ritual, 427.

SALVADO DOM, O.S.B., in Western Australia, 58; made Bishop of Port Victoria, 71; *see* Australia, Western.

Sayce, A. H., Introduction to the Science of Language, *noticed*, 478.

Segneri's Practice of Interior Recollection, *noticed*, 508.

Sensation, Unconscious, rejected by Dr. Bastian, 30.

Serra Dom, O.S.B., in Western Australia, 58 *seq.*

Slavs, introduction of Christianity among, 422; their vernacular ritual, 424.

Somerset, Duke of, Monarchy and Democracy, *noticed*, 243.

Sompting Church, 267.

Spalding, Douglas, on instinct in birds, 38.

——— Bishop, on Position of Catholics in United States, 97.

Starovetzi in Russian Church, 431.

Sussex, Western, 251; antiquities of: Celtic, 254; Roman, 256; Saxon, 267.

Synod, Holy, in Russian Church, 433.

- THOMAS OF AQUIN, St., Pope Leo XIII. on, 196.
 Thompson, E. Healy, Life of Henri M. Boudon, *noticed*, 232.
 Tiele, Dr. C. P., Outlines of the History of Religion, *noticed*, 242.
 Tractarianism and Ritualism, 76.
 Tractarian party, past and present, 77; sparse exodus of, in '45—'50, 79;
 failure of, 80; what it has not done, 84; what it does, 85; antagonism
 to bishops, *ib*; subject to nation, 90; why tolerated, 94.
 ULLATHORNE, Bishop, arrival in Sydney, 59; The Endowments of Man,
 noticed, 208.
 United States, Position of Catholics in, 97; increase of Catholics in, 98;
 dangers to Church in, 99, 102; city dangers in, to Catholics, 104; advan-
 tages to settlers out west, 107; Catholic colonization, association of, 108;
 advantages to be derived, 111.
 VARIORUM Teachers' Bible, *noticed*, 506.
 WALLACE, Edwin, Outlines of Philosophy of Aristotle, *noticed*, 244.
 Wallon, H., Histoire du Tribunal Revolutionnaire de Paris, *noticed*, 500.
 Walsh, G. J., D.D., Tractatus de Actibus Humanis, *noticed*, 225.
 Woman's Mission, True and False Sense of, 290, 301, 305, 310;
 Womanhood, French study of Christian, 288; Plautilla and Greek and Roman,
 291; St. Cecilia and Martyrs, 292; Beatrice, 294; St. Teresa, 295;
 Elizabeth Seton and the New World, 298.
 Wood, Alexander, on Western Sussex, 251.
 Worsley, Henry, on Methods of Historical Inquiry, 269.

END OF VOL. V.

9;
m

n,

8;
an-
8;

an,
95;